DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 722 HE 002 352

TITLE	The Academy in Turmoil. First Report of the Temporary Commission to Study the Causes of Campus Unrest.
INSTITUTION	New York State Legislature, Albany.
PUB DATE	1 Feb 70
NOTE	195p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism, *College Students, *Higher Education, Social Problems, *Student Attitudes, *Student Behavior, Student College Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*New York State

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to discover the underlying and fundamental causes of campus unrest. An attempt was also made to determine how much of campus unrest is a reflection of social ills, and how much is a reflection of current dissatisfactions and uneasiness concerning college curriculum. The report opens with a prologue by the Commission chairman Charles D. Henderson, which is followed by a statement by Stanley J. Reiben, the Commission's counsel, which expresses his insights into the problems of youth, and summarizes his impressions gained during the study year regarding the causes of campus unrest. The report deals with: (1) the structure of higher education in New York State; (2) campus unrest as a national phenomenon; (3) the scope of campus unrest in New York State, 1967-69; (4) selected case studies of campus unrest in New York State and some observations drawn from these case studies; (5) student concerns for reforming institutions of higher learning; (6) the proper role of constituents of the college community; (7) a summary of the 8 public meetings that were held throughout the State; and (8) the conclusions and recommendations. The act establishing the Commission is included in the appendix. (AF)

ED052722

N·SG
HE

NEW YORK STATE

The Academy in Turmoil

FIRST REPORT

OF

THE TEMPORARY COMMISSION

TO STUDY THE CAUSES OF CAMPUS UNREST

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 352

ALBANY, N. Y.

FEBRUARY 1, 1970

Second Printing—SEPTEMBER 1, 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
	Letter of Transmittal	v
	Commission Members	vii
	Acknowledgments	ix
	Chairman's Prologue	1
	Introduction	39
I	The Structure of Higher Education in New York State	45
II	Campus Unrest as a National Phenomenon	49
III	The Scope of Campus Unrest in New York State, 1967-69	61
IV	Selected Case Studies of Campus Unrest in New York State	77
V	Some Observations from the Case Studies	93
VI	Student Concerns for Reforming Institutions of Higher Learning	107
VII	Proper Role of Constituents of the College Community	135
VIII	Summary of Public Meetings	163
IX	Conclusions and Recommendations	181
	Appendix Chapter 1117 of the Laws of 1969	193

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To The Governor and The Legislature:

On behalf of the Temporary Commission to Study the Causes of Campus Unrest I hereby submit to you our First Report, pursuant to Chapter 1117 of the Laws of 1969.

Charles D. Henderson, Chairman

THE COMMISSION

Assemblyman Charles D. Henderson, Chairman
Senator John E. Flynn, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman William F. Passannante, Secretary

MEMBERS

APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT
PRO TEM OF THE SENATE

Senators
John E. Flynn
Edward J. Speno
Albert B. Lewis

APPOINTED BY THE SPEAKER
OF THE ASSEMBLY

Assemblymen
Charles D. Henderson
Alvin M. Suchin
William F. Passannante

APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR

Edward F. Carpenter
Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr.
Edward V. Regan, Esq.

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

Earl W. Brydges, President Pro Tem of the Senate
Perry B. Duryea, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
John E. Kingston, Majority Leader of the Assembly
Joseph Zaretski, Minority Leader of the Senate
Stanley Steingut, Minority Leader of the Assembly
Warren M. Anderson, Chairman, Senate Finance Committee
Willis H. Stephens, Chairman, Assembly Ways and Means Committee
Edward J. Speno, Chairman, Senate Majority Conference

STAFF

Lloyd L. Hogan . . . . . .Executive Director
Stanley J. Reiben. . . . . Counsel
Joan A. Norrish. . . . . .Administrative Assistant
Audrey K. Boag . . . . . Research Associate (Psychology)
Bruce B. Detlefsen . . . . .Research Associate (Education)
Jan C. Smolik. . . . . .Research Associate (Sociology)
Audrey S. Kasha. . .Research Assistant (Political Science)

Consultants

S. Walter Andersen . . . . . .Education
Muriel E. Galleher . . . . . Governmental Relations
Virginia A. Jaeger . . . . . .Personnel Affairs
Serphin R. Maltese . . . . . .Jurisprudence
Ernest G. Peltz. . . . . Administration
Earl L. Vessup . . . . . .Student Affairs

Secretarial Assistants

Betty S. Dixon
Jeannette F. Hoyle
Elaine F. O'Connell
Jane F. Visk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to express our deep appreciation and unbounded gratitude to all those who have helped us during the past seven months. Students, faculty, administrators, the general public, state and local officials can all take pride in any good which may emanate from this report. Needless to say, we bear full responsibility for errors of omission or commission.

CHAIRMAN'S PROLOGUE

The Temporary State Commission to Study the Causes of Campus Unrest is fully aware that its function is not to bring out a report that will be a sedative for the public's uneasiness and anxiety concerning the unrest and destruction on the campuses. The Commission is aware that it cannot come up with a report that will be a recipe for providing the Legislature with a solution to the moral, legal and administrative problems of handling the disruptions, civil disobedience and violations of civil rights that are often involved in student activism.

The Commission fully recognizes that a solution is sorely needed. The Commission has, in the limited time of its existence, examined the symptoms of the unrest and disruptions on campuses and hopefully will be able to use the facts accumulated from its study to better delineate how much of the campus unrest is a reflection of social ills and how much of the campus unrest is current dissatisfactions and uneasiness concerning college curriculum.

It is also an earnest hope of the Commission that its study will reveal how much of the dissatisfaction of the curriculum is felt by others beyond the highly audible protest groups. For example:

(a) How many patient students are noting weaknesses in the curriculum and are so far quietly protesting instead of being disruptive?

(b) How many students are silent because of their fearfulness of the risks of protest?

The Commission recognizes that its greatest purpose must be to learn how deep the current of college activism runs and the potential of rising activism.

While the Commission is directed, in addition to studying the causes of campus unrest, to report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature, such recommendations without further study in depth of the causes must be understood to be limited to the Commission's inquiry to date.

There are those who may in all sincerity suggest a sole solution to this complex problem, but there are others who for perhaps a self-serving or political motive use the youth of this state and nation to publicize their own aims or careers.

The use of these issues for ulterior purposes must be strongly condemned since what it amounts to is playing with the lives of our children and the lives of those yet unborn for personal gain.

Recognizing the sensitivity of our assignment, the Commission adopted and pursued a policy of LISTEN and LEARN throughout our study and deliberations. We listened honestly and impartially to all who communicated with us - students, faculty, administrators and others. We were mindful, while many simplified solutions were offered, that there was no one single solution. Our precept was no pre-conceived ideas and our mission one of fact finding.

It is paramount that we not forget that the youth of today will be the social and political power of tomorrow. They are the

greatest resource in this nation; they are our own people, not some foreign enemy. How this great resource is developed today determines their future as responsible parents, productive citizens and public officials who will guide the destiny of our nation.

Youth is and always has been impatient, idealistic, imaginative and visionary. They see injustices and inequities and want them corrected immediately. They are saying to their elders, "Won't someone listen and care?" When they are convinced that no one is listening they turn to their only means of gaining attention, vocal turmoil and demonstration.

Such a course is not new and has been pursued many times in the history of the world. Would not this statement be true today? "What is happening to our young people? They disrespect their elders. They disobey their parents. They ignore the laws. They riot in the streets, inflamed with wild notions. Their morals are decaying. What is to become of them?" Socrates said this about the youth of two thousand years ago.

While youth see the injustices, they have not acquired the basics from which to work to solve the problems, nor do they have the authority. Their opinions and concerns are based on what surrounds them in the present world and what they see ahead.

I am not sure that the values of previous eras of history are being taught by parents, schools and higher education institutions in a meaningful and relevant manner so as to instill a pride and

respect for the basic foundation of this Republic. The basic principles of our Republic can be utilized to solve the social injustices that still exist and for which solutions have lain stagnant too long.

But each of us must understand the processes of our government before we are qualified to change them. So we must develop ways of listening to youth and hearing what they are saying. We must respect their views as young adults and develop channels of dialogue by which they have a voice in the decisions that control their lives.

It is healthy and good that the old should resist the young and that the young should prod the old. From this tension, as from the strifes in life, is created tensiled strength, a stimulated development, a basic unity and creation of the whole.

It is fortunate that new ideas should be expressed for the sake of the few that can be used. But it is also essential that new ideas should be compelled to go through the mill of objection, opposition and constant scrutiny. This is the trial which innovations must survive before being permitted to become a part of our way of life.

The right to dissent is inherent in our Republic and should not be thwarted. It is well that some students care enough about world issues to publicly proclaim their views.

However, we cannot condone students or faculty or any other groups who, under the guise of free speech, flagrantly violate the freedom of speech, freedom of choice, freedom to assemble, or to block, trespass and infringe on the rights of other individuals or groups.

It is a distortion of academic freedom to attempt to create anarchy on campus and attempt to supplant our government with a totalitarian form of government in the name of freedom of expression.

It is my firm opinion that none of the grievances of any of our students justifies violence, destruction of property, forcibly taking over of buildings and making hostages of school officials.

Unfortunately, human events often run ahead of formulated policy. Many universities have been caught without guidelines governing demonstrations.

Every college administrator must assume the responsibility of establishing fair but firm rules, regulations and guidelines for conduct of students, faculty and staff. College authorities must be steadfast and persistent in assuring compliance with the established guidelines. Penalties for violations must be made certain and crystal clear.

I firmly believe that the primary responsibility and jurisdiction for the maintenance and enforcement of order on our college property belongs to the trustees and administrators. Responsibility is the correlative of leadership.

While few may want to admit it, the dissent of youth may have done more for higher education than any legislative body, offices of education or groups of educators simply because public attention has been focussed on a burgeoning sick system and explosive societal ills.

It will take men of wisdom, compassion and understanding to resolve the crisis which we face. We must resolve to deal with the faults of others as gently as with our own.

I have asked Mr. Stanley J. Reiben, Counsel to the Commission and attorney with more than three decades of experience defending young people in the courts, to prepare a statement

(a) expressing some of his insights into the problems of youth, and

(b) summarizing his impressions gained during the past year with reference to the causes of campus unrest.

Mr. Reiben's statement follows.

Charles D. Henderson
Chairman

Personal Commentary by Stanley J. Reiben, Counsel.

Why Hast Thou Forsaken Me?

The most striking single impression which the members of the Commission received during the year at public meetings was the sincerity and honesty of the students. They spoke with urgency and with a depth of feeling for the brotherhood of man. And they seemed to believe that the quest for peace is still the noblest venture of mankind. This report shows that in order to catch our attention and impress upon us the need for action they have used means which were legal and illegal, peaceful and violent, constructive and destructive. At times they used language which was shocking; but at other times they spoke with the eloquence of the great poets.

In a repetition of some language found in the Declaration of Independence they have endlessly repeated:

> "We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity."

Our young feel that we too have been "deaf to the voice of justice". And so there has been a feeling of alienation and an inevitable interruption of our "connections and correspondence". Yet, underlying everything

they have said in the rejection of our institutions and their feeling of being rejected by their elders could be detected a wistful, soulful plea to us and to people everywhere to please listen and talk and work with them on a meaningful basis of equality. Always one theme was recurrent, not spoken, but felt. Why? And we did not answer or we lied. When we answered it was with hypocrit -ical platitudes, until finally, more in sorrow than in anger, they asked "Father, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Framework of the Student Perspective

In order to better understand what has been occurring these past few years amongst our young we must first understand their view of the world in which they live. The first fact upon which to base such an understanding is their physical age. Most of our young people today were born about the early 1950's. Before they grew to an age when they were aware of the world around them it was the decade of the 1960's. To them the earth-shaking events known as the depression, World War II and the Korean conflict were part of the history books. Events which had direct relevance and meaning to them within their own experience started with the sixties.

Their beginnings took place in Washington on a clear, cold day with a sun shining so brightly as to almost say "We have created a special light in which to bathe a favorite of the gods". And in that historic moment a young,

vibrant voice signalled the birth of a new age:

> "Let the word go forth--the torch has passed to a new generation."

To them this was a new age--a hope, a faith, a promise--of which dreams are made. It was a beginning to make the American dream a reality. Their country was really to be the land of the free and the home of the brave. Youthful energies and ideals, as epitomized by their nation's new leader would truly change their world for the better.

Indeed, not only the young but people throughout the world responded with a new note of optimism and a feeling of buoyancy, almost mystical in its pervasiveness and exciting in its promise for the future. People everywhere found this voice of the new generation irresistible. From his courage they took courage, from his optimism they became optimistic, from his seeming invincibility they developed hope and from his words they developed faith.

But to the young he was theirs and theirs alone. They did not mind sharing him and they looked to him to be their voice in making all understand that this was truly a new renaissance. He spoke their words, he espoused their faith, he expressed their beliefs and exemplified their ideals. He had come not to take them to the promised land but to fulfill the promise of their own land. Their ideals, untarnished by time, were given brightness and the light reflecting from them was to illuminate and warm the coldest

recesses of the human spirit. To them, truly, in their land all men were to be equal, endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. And so, secure in their faith the governed gladly consented to be governed.

In one horrifying second darkness descended. When most of our students were just in their early teens, the most formative and impressionable period of their lives, the colors of the flag which so proudly waved assumed new meanings. The red stood for the blood of their fallen leader, the blue stood for a mood of despair so great that it still pervades their attitudes and the white stood for the purity of a grief so intense that it consumed their hopes and dreams. They could truly repeat

> "I know you: Solitary griefs,
> Desolate passions,
> Aching hours!
>
> I know you: Tremulous beliefs,
> Agonized hopes,
> And ashen flowers!"

But their cup had not yet runneth over!

In the remaining years of the decade as they slowly came back to life and turned their heads again to the sun they opened their hearts and extended their hands and faith to yet two more leaders they admired, who spoke of love and peace and equality. And twice more were their spokesmen to be murdered. To those who would hear, in the silence of the desolated land, there came from our young a "sob which in silence cursed deeper than the strong man in his wrath". For in these three graves lay more than bodies

alone. Buried with their leaders were their hopes laid waste, their dreams shattered, their ideals assassinated. And still they had another station of their cross.

Throughout the decade, in true climactic style, another tragedy was engulfing them. While assassination occupied the center of the stage which is the play of the life of our young, offstage, first slowly and quietly and then faster and louder, came the sound of a different drummer--the drums of war--a war for them in which to die. And so they turned their young, grief stricken and puzzled faces to us, their elders, and said "Why?", Father, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Conflict

In the 1930's America and the world saw a period in which for most people the primary objective of every day life was a square meal. In the midst of this struggle demagogues everywhere had a field day. One made not much greater impression than another. But there was one in Europe who was making a greater impression than all the rest. First ignored and then appeased was the strident voice of a madman, a megalomaniac who in September 1939 led the world into a new war.

With the end of World War II America, which had devoted its energies and its manpower to the destruction of Hitler and the militaristic aims of Japan, could not wait

to harness its resources to peace. It was an uneasy peace. Our temporary ally in that war, Russia, perceived that the wreckage of war was a fertile breeding ground for spreading its ideological beliefs by force or otherwise. They had well judged the American desire to bring the boys home and so, pursuant to a plan and agreements reached during the course of the war, they set out to accomplish the same objective as Hitler but with the use of different tactics. And so directly from a hot war America went into a cold war.

To add to all of this the sleeping giant in the Far East (Mao's takeover of China as an example) began to stir and wake and so ~~we got involved~~ in a hot war. The hot phase of Korea terminated but the pressures continued both in Europe and in the Pacific. And once again America went back to a cold war. Imperceptibly, inexorably, we were being drawn in once again to a hot war in Viet Nam. And so for thirty years this nation has been at war, hot or cold. This was an epoch unparalleled in our history. We had never experienced a period of such lengthy duration with so many strains. Our national nervous system was not designed or equipped to cope with thirty years of endless pressure and conflict. At the same time the depression generation was bent on making up for all it had missed when it was young. With an unprecedented prosperity creating the opportunities we made up for our lost youth with

a vengeance--not one car but two; not one home but two; not one TV but two or more. In fact we wanted more of everything. For many families more of everything is what they got. But as they achieved this state of material well-being they also wanted the time to enjoy it. And so a whole new industry--leisure--was created and the time to enjoy the leisure was made. However, hot and cold war plus domestic discontent from those who felt left out, were creating tensions which intruded themselves upon the enjoyment of our leisure. Furthermore, these conflicts were interfering with our desires until we got to a point where we just did not want to hear about them any more. We had fought a depression and we had fought thirty years of war. We were middle aged and tired and wanted only some peace and quiet and the time to enjoy our money in that peace. Unfortunately, the events and circumstances which created the conflicts kept intruding and depriving us of fulfilling this very natural desire.

So we withdrew. We just got tired of the endless waves rocking our boat. Our nervous system had reached a point where we would either reject or ignore these pressures or else it would crack. We developed a protective shell in order to preserve our material status quo and the time and the peace to enjoy it. We closed our ears to the anguished cries of the deprived and the downtrodden.

We created an age of non-involvement.

But our young, really wanting the same peace and quiet, but knowing there was a great deal of work still to be done before it could be achieved, asked for our help, for our continued efforts to cure the mess which was their heritage. But in their eyes we refused.

In today's idiom our answer to their plea was "Get a hair cut", "You don't know how lucky you are"; etc.. The fact that we had simply run out of gas in piloting the plane through thirty years of storms was not apparent to them, nor for that matter, to us. Even if it were it probably would not have made any difference because the cumulative experience of those thirty years had left its mark on the young also.

Historically, times of great national distress create confusion which, in turn, creates attempts to strike back at the rules and institutions which created the uncertainties.

Crime rates always rise in such periods. As we know over half of the crimes are committed by young people. Oversimplifying, the reason for this is a feeling that the rules by which we live have no relevance or meaning for them and their future. They become rebellious, unruly and destructive of the way of life which created their uncertainty of the future. They looked to change the rules

since ours had not worked very well.

While they are looking to remake their own destinies in ways which appear valid to them we, in our middle age resignation, are looking for something less hectic. Just when they need the guidance of a sympathetic, steadying hand to help them chart their own course we find we have lost the energy with which to extend it.

The Techno-Nuclear Age

Under the stress of military pressures this nation, applying all of its great industrial and scientific knowledge, startled the world in 1945 with the explosion of a new type of bomb over Hiroshima. What it never realized was that the bomb signalled the birth of a new age. The weapon was designed to end the war with Japan with a minimum of American casualties. But to this day we don't know how many other casualties the age to which it gave birth has created. When the bomb was planned very little thought was given to its social, economic, political or moral implications. And not much more thought has been applied to these questions since.

Students of history have, since the late 19th century, been attempting to study the effects of the industrial revolution. Without going into details it is undisputed that the change from an agrarian to an industrial economy had a greater impact upon the quality of our lives than any other single development. It also brought with it an eventual realization that those values, standards and beliefs by which men could live "down on the farm" would never suffice "after they had seen Paree". And so eventually different values evolved.

Whether these values were good, bad or indifferent is not the point. What is important is the fact that it was recognized

that for man to live with each other in an industrial age required a totally new course.

The extraordinary advances of the techno-nuclear age have brought with them extraordinary new problems. The age is growing around us, but growing as it sees fit without direction or purpose and creating a whole new spectrum of problems. For instance, its discoveries have helped us reach the moon, but have they helped us reach our fellow man? This is the core question our young ask us, but to which we neither have an answer nor have we made a serious attempt to discover one.

These new forces we have unleashed seem to have built-in self-starting effects which we have yet to comprehend. Furthermore, these effects seem to move with the same speed socially that a computer develops mechanically. For instance, does anyone know the social effects of a speed-up in communications so great that it brings today's war into our living room? And in living color!

We have observed that modern communications and the events which have fostered them created a whole new language--a language of slogans. We now attempt to convey our innermost feelings by catch words and phrases. But is this a successful means by which we can talk to another? Is the mind and spirit and heart of man geared to absorb instant communications delivered by slogan shorthand, or has this method of communication created a language and a speed which escapes our comprehension, thereby creating its own communication gap? Does anyone know?

Is it the speed of today's developments and our possible inability to adjust to that speed which possibly creates an inability to comprehend developments and therefore adds to the confusion and conflicts of our daily life? If that is so, it would appear to be obvious that the values, standards, and beliefs which fitted the pre-nuclear age have become out-moded. It may very well be that the rush of events has created a vacuum of generally accepted values while nothing has appeared to take the place of the traditional ones. Certainly, if such a vacuum does exist, the dangers and threats to our way of life are self evident.

The New Culture

It is suggested that the effects of the techno-nuclear age may be the source of a vacuum of values. It appears that our young people have sensed this long before we did, and since there either was no guidance from their elders or many of them had lost faith in such guidance, many of them have gone about creating their own. It is in this framework that some of the habits which their elders find so objectionable must be understood.

There is another urgent point to be made in connection with the new culture. It must be understood that campus unrest, as it relates to societal ills, simply mirrors and reflects the unrest of our young people everywhere, whether

university students or not, whether American or not. The question was asked over and over in the meetings of this past year: "If Viet Nam ended tomorrow, would campus unrest end tomorrow?" And the answer universally from administrator, teacher and student alike was "No". Further proof of this is the fact that the same disturbances created by the same age groups have been growing all over the world, very often in nations which are not at all involved in Viet Nam. Therefore, this phase cannot be discussed simply within the limitation of a university campus since to our young everywhere "all the world is a campus".

We must realize that the issues of societal ills which so moved our young people are far more deep-rooted and complex than a campus sit-in would lead us to believe. And it is based upon the fact that these causes and reactions are world-wide, that we must understand that our young everywhere are attempting to create a new set of values by which to live.

They have developed communal ways of life. They justify this communal form of life with the concept that equality and love of each other dictate no other course of conduct but the sharing of everything--the joint sharing of experience and emotion and feeling and food and housing and money. An extremely interesting and possibly highly significant aspect of this phase is the fact that many young people from affluent

families have wholeheartedly joined this movement. Heretofore it was always deemed that one purpose of education was to enable one to earn a living so that they may become affluent, and that once they attained affluence they would lose their ideals or, at the very least, not fight for them. Yet, here we have a generation which is already affluent and still is part of this movement. In the midst of their affluence they seem to have realized that: "Man cannot live by bread alone." This is a development which requires deep study since it may signify a future in which our young, despite the affluence which may develop in later years, may continue to fight in larger numbers than ever before to eliminate the ills which beset mankind.

They have adopted new modes of dress and different modes of wearing their hair. Accustomed to our own style of clothing and hair, most people find this highly objectionable. Yet, in the framework in which our young live, there is no valid reason for our rejecting them solely because of this. It is understandable that these things offend our sense of the esthetic, but that is not the question. The question is why these youngsters adopted these "odd" means of expressing themselves. The answer, of course, is that since our values are meaningless to them, they will express their rejection of those values in as total a manner as possible. They believe we are bankrupt in our moral views. They believe that we have created a world in which we speak of peace and practice

war; we speak of brotherhood and practice discrimination; we speak of love and express hatred. In their eyes, if these are the values which are expressed by a three-button suit and a clean haircut, they would under those circumstances rather follow the dicta:

Tune in
Turn on
Drop out.

The dicta just referred to over-simplifies the immense growth of a new phenomenon--the whole subject of drugs.

We all have a tendency to refer to the various substances which are used by many of our young people and, for that matter, many of our older people, as "drugs". But this is inaccurate. What we really are talking about generally when we speak of drugs are narcotic type drugs, such as heroin, and in recent years, the chemical drugs such as LSD. The harm which ensues from the use of this type of drug has been pretty well defined. We have been able to establish the fact that narcotics and most chemical drugs have adverse effects upon the user, some of the effects being very severe and some leading to death. We further know that the individual who uses the narcotic or chemical drug in most cases becomes addicted to it and we also know that addiction is one of the most difficult ailments to break that is known to man. If we can break the addictive circle we could probably prevent the user from harming or even destroying himself. It should be noted that addiction does not confine itself to the aforementioned type of drugs but also afflicts millions of people in this nation who drink

alcohol. The social, physical and economic consequences of addiction must be measured in the billions of dollars and in an unknown number of lives. Yet, we have no major research plan to uncover the causes of addiction.

This Commission has also found that in the past year at least students, if not the rest of our young people, are beginning to understand the consequences of using narcotic or chemical drugs and by ever greater numbers are staying away from that type of drug. They have become educated to the problems caused by those drugs and are educating their fellow students. They have become the single biggest deterrent force against the use of these "hard" type drugs.

Marijuana is something else altogether. We have long since become accustomed to the concept that marijuana is a dangerous drug, that it inevitably leads to the use of heroin or a similar narcotic or chemical type drug, and that its use will just as surely destroy the user eventually as suicide itself. Unfortunately there is no concrete evidence to support these conclusions. What is unknown to the general public is that just as much marijuana is used by our elders as by our young, but to the young it has become another means of showing their rejection of outmoded values.

We do have concrete evidence, perhaps inconclusive but overwhelming, that the ordinary cigarette made of tobacco is harmful to the smoker. We have no evidence that the marijuana

cigarette is harmful to the smoker. Yet, to the young a picture appears of their elders, while smoking a tobacco cigarette, sending them to prison for smoking a marijuana cigarette. They know enough of history to know that their elders when they were young lived in a period when it was a crime to buy and sell alcoholic drinks. And they further know the futility of that law despite the fact that there is concrete evidence that the use of alcohol can be harmful. And so every day we blight the lives of youngsters by imposing prison sentences or giving them criminal records for doing something for which they can find no evidence of harm, and they look at us with a jaundiced eye. What could be more typical of the hypocrisy of their elders? And so, in simple defience of rules which have no validity to them and are questioned by many others, they "tune in, turn on, and drop out".

They have added another dimension to their new culture, a dimension which at first and to this day is still met with objection by some of their elders. They express their feelings in song. They are songs which tell stories and the stories express their yearnings and their pleas. They gather together in great numbers and celebrate their togetherness by singing these songs and listening to them. In this State this past summer we witnessed such a gathering at Woodstock. When it was over the Sheriff of the county said "These kids are

beautiful". It is doubtful that 400,000 adults could be gathered together for three days or more, living outdoors in rain and in mud with primitive sanitary facilities without killing, assaulting, raping and robbing each other. But this is what our young did, and this is what the Sheriff meant.

It is impossible for the perceptive listener to listen to the lyrics of their song styles, to listen to a Dylan, or a Guthrie, without thinking back to the hymnals of our black brothers gathering and singing their prayers. And so we have a life style, a quasi-religious movement, if you will. They have their beliefs--peace and love and brotherhood--and these are difficult beliefs with which to argue. They have their means of living those beliefs--a communal means. They have their songs which are almost a liturgy in which to express those beliefs. And they take their drugs as a means of communion in their rejection of the hypocritical standards of their elders.

The University Structure

We have spoken about the young as a whole, since the societal problems of the college student cannot be separated from those of our young people generally. However, the mandate of the Commission does speak of the university campus itself.

There are reasons why general complaints of students focus on the campus structures. First, many of them live there. Second, the university is their own particular community. Third, it is another institution and institutions are under attack all over.

In the December 26th, 1969 issue of Time Magazine the lead story dealt with "The New Ministry: Bringing God Back to Life". The entire story deals with the attack upon the institution of the church as we have always known it, by its own members, both minister and congregation. The story discusses the fact that those ministers who have been able to rebuild their congregations in the past decade have been those who have been able to speak in the new idioms. The story shows that this new type minister has been able to bring youth back into the church by adopting their message to the plea of the young. It would therefore be extremely odd if the students did not attack the institution of the university to which they are closest.

They are students; unfortunately, the structure of the university clearly seems open to attack.

The Commission finds that a large number of universities was structured vertically so that the students, for whom the university exists in the first place, were on the bottom of the totem pole.

On top of the pole was the board of trustees. Most students have never seen a trustee in their life. It is also a fact that most trustees were chosen to serve on the board not because of their educational expertise but because of their fiscal expertise. Certainly, it must be admitted that in these times of extremely explosive demands for more higher education there must be priorities allocated to fund raising and fiscal management. However, if the board of trustees sets the policy for the university, their knowledge must be far broader than the field of fiscal management, or financial contributions.

We found that administrators by and large had to spend much of their time in fund raising. We did find that many presidents, shaken by the events of the past couple of years, were devoting more of their time tc the academic community and are sincerely attempting to understand what occurred and what to do about it. We found most administrators were actively working with the various segments of their communities to give students and faculty a more meaningful role in the structure of the university.

Among the faculty we found some of the greatest divisions. Even there we found young teachers with different views than older teachers. We found that there was a lack of agreement on the role of the university. We further found in many cases they were as powerless as the students.

Until this past year or two there seemed to be a lack of good communication between students and other segments of the community, primarily administrators and board of trustees. Some universities are attempting to cure this and some are proceeding with greater speed than others and with a greater comprehension of the probl ms.

Educational Structure

In many colleges students have been excluded from the decision making and policy making process. Yet their ability to grasp facts and issues would certainly appear to qualify them for shouldering far more responsibility than they have heretofore been afforded. Educational structures have not fully geared themselves to the capabilities and potentialities of the students--the main purpose of education itself.

Numerous complaints were directed toward university standards of admissions. Whether or not a student should be admitted to a university appeared to be based on concepts which had very little to do with whether or not the individual had desire and capacity and could benefit from an education in that particular institution.

Curriculum was one of the things discussed most by the students and very often by faculty. Varying students have varying interests and they feel that many of the courses they are required to take have no meaning or connection with the interests which they want to pursue. They strongly feel that by the time they reach the university they should be allowed to take courses which are directly meaningful to them. Some institutions have already commenced reshaping their curriculum in order to achieve

a program more consistent with student needs; many have not.

Some students appeared to have no real desire to be in college and were a part of an involuntary campus. They were there because business and industry are more and more requiring a college degree for employment. A college degree has become a certificate and every youngster must have one regardless of his own personal interests or desires. Such students may become restless, chafe under the forced feeding of the unwanted educational pressures and delight in causing mischief, if only to break the monotony.

Further making for unrest is the new pressure that a bachelor's degree alone is insufficient; in order to get a good job now one requires a graduate degree. Industrial, civil service and statutory job descriptions very often call for university degrees--bachelor and graduate--which bear no relation to the job itself. If therefore a youngster is driven on to the campus by artificial pressures without wanting to be there in the first place, his receptivity to the educational process is not of the highest order. But when he knows that he must further go on to graduate school and spend eight to ten years in an atmosphere of which he did not want to become a part originally, his frame of mind is almost that of an inmate in a penal institution.

Higher education in this state is moving toward an open admission policy. Numerous programs have already been undertaken to get our culturally deprived youngsters into the higher educational system. The objective is highly laudable. It must be pointed out however that this very desirable program has within it the seeds of major causes of campus unrest.

Youngsters coming from culturally deprived backgrounds and put into the same programs with the same standards for passing and failing as other youngsters who had more advantages, start off with an added burden. Many of the poorer ones have difficulty in keeping up. Their social background has bred within them a feeling of resentment toward a system which they consider has created their deprivations. Their inability to keep up with their more fortunate classmates deepens that resentment. They very often release those feelings by words or actions against the institution which they consider to be part of the establishment which has already harmed them. Those same feelings can and have been directed against their fellow students. A means must be found by which students who will be coming into the system with poor preparation can have the opportunity to develop to their fullest potential.

An overlooked cause of campus unrest is faculty unrest and pressures upon the faculty which do not directly relate to their ability to capture the imagination and mind of their students. One example of this is the system of evaluation of faculty by the quantity of their publications.

The educational system would seem to require the relations between students, faculty and the other elements of the academic community which would have a large degree of personal involvement. Some universities are so huge that many students can spend four years attending them without knowing what is going on. Such an atmosphere creates a feeling that the learning process is thoroughly impersonal, faceless and institutionalized to such a point that it is a factory rather than a community of scholars in which the "unfettered search for truth" can be pursued.

The Campus Conclusions

It would be odd indeed if the university were not under attack, since institutions everywhere are under attack, and not by the young alone. Political, social, economic and other institutions have shown an inability or an unwillingness to respond to today's stresses. The reasons are deep and complex. Some indication of the complexities can be determined from other portions of this report. Because of these complexities solutions may not be attained merely by legislation. This especially applies to some repressive legislation which has been introduced and discussed in the past. Such legislation would only intensify the conditions which are already sufficiently strained. Its contribution toward a solution of problems whose causes are deep-rooted and complex is extremely doubtful.

Real solutions should be pursued on a voluntary basis, applied internally within each university, and fit to particular problems. The problems of the urban university may have different emphasis than the problems of the rural university. Large university governance may require different shadings than that of the small university. Co-ed schools may require different rules than non-co-ed schools. But one thing must be stressed. Changes must be made. The universities must be more responsive to the demands of the times and understand the demands of students who are more advanced than previous student generations.

The universities should be given additional time in which to move to meet these challenges without necessitating the Legislature to mandate any particular form of change. In the meantime the Commission should be empowered to continue its study in order to observe the changes being made and in order to determine whether these changes are sufficiently responsive to the needs of the times.

The changes must of necessity carry within them the fundamental guarantees of due process. Meaningful participation in the control of the destiny of the members of the academic community must be accorded to each member of that community.

There is another phase of university disturbance which must and should be discussed and recommendations made. Until the last year or two in this nation, the type of disturbance within the university which led to violence have been so rare that when they did break out most administrators and boards found themselves at a loss as to how they should be handled. There was over-reaction, no reaction or under-reaction. Some violence was met with violence or else equivocation. The experience of certain universities in the use of the injunctive process appears to have been the most successful method of meeting actions which were potentially violent or interfered with the rights of others. The advantages to the university of availing itself of judicial process rather than police is that the judicial process can be used to prevent students from

interfering with the civil rights of other students. It has been the experience that most students will obey a court order.

There is a further advantage in separating those students who still have a sufficient respect for the courts and the law so that they will obey a court order, from the anarchists whose philosophical and ideological view is that the state is the enemy and the state must be destroyed. By far the great majority of students abhor and eschew violence and that number is growing all the time. They have rejected the extremist position of the handful who refuse to obey a lawful order of the court. Those students who refuse to obey a lawful court order will be further isolated and identified as students who are attempting to lead the majority down the path of anarchy, a path which most students do not want to take despite their sympathy for the aims of some radicals.

On the other hand, many students resent the presence of a local police force on their campus. There are reasons for this. Traditionally, all components of the university community have felt that they can handle their own problems without interference from outside authority. Additionally, our local police forces, being faced with a new and unique situation, have not had the specialized training necessary for handling a group of idealistically motivated young people. Even when they are wrong they cannot be treated like a group of hoodlums

banded together for the purpose of thievery or robbery. But it would appear that police tactics are generally the same in both cases. Police require a more specialized training to cope with student demonstrations.

There is another problem in connection with local police action as against the injunctive process. Once the court issues an order, a student can be liable to a variety of punishments for the simple disobedience of the order itself, beyond and above what else he may or may not have done. On the other hand, numerous lawyers have expressed some degree of doubt as to the constitutionality of criminal trespass convictions when the defendant is a duly admitted student committing the alleged offense upon university property where the student has a right to be. The last objection of course is that very often, when local police have been called in and students resisted, greater violence ensues.

The Commission, however, makes very clear that we unanimously condemn the use of violence by anyone, and especially by those who feel they have a grievance. Violence begets violence, destruction begets destruction. Whatever weaknesses there may be in the use of the democratic process, it is still the best process yet devised, and its destruction will be a far greater harm to all concerned than the ills from which it now suffers. Violence will eventually destroy that which ostensibly violence is attempting to cure, by creating political vacuums which history has proven will always be filled with dictators.

General Conclusions

The most important general conclusion that can be pointed out is that there is a sufficient number of students who have lost faith in our present institutions and the present methods of responding to societal ills, that they have "dropped-out". They have turned their backs on everything and everyone whom they consider to be of the established order. This number is growing. It is growing sufficiently that there is a very real danger that we shall lose an entire generation. We shall lose them in death on battlefields and we shall lose them on social battlefields. Our young are the most precious thing we have; when we have lost one, that is one too many. When we have lost all, we have lost everything.

We must understand that the questions raised by the students are of fundamental validity and they cannot be disregarded. We must do everything within our power to understand and encourage them to stay within the political processes. It is for this reason that we must consider lowering the voting age to give them an opportunity to participate in the political process. There is nothing sanctified about the age of 21. It was an age arbitrarily set decades ago, long before youth had the degree of education, maturity and awareness of the present generation. More important, if we are to plead that they channel their protests through the political process, we cannot deprive them of the tools by which to do that. The most important tool of course is the franchise. They are well equipped to exercise it. Most

students understand that although the political process will not work as quickly as they would like, it does work and can work. It is just as urgent for their elders to understand the youth.

During commission meetings a member of the Commission made the statement that "a university is a fragile thing". The same can be said for the human spirit and for faith in each other; a faith between older and younger has been badly injured. It is up to the older to prove to the younger that no matter what happened yesterday, from today that faith can be restored. It is up to the older and also to the younger to once more open our ears and our minds and our hearts to each other, and to talk to each other instead of talking at each other. It is up to all of us, hand in hand, with mutual respect for each other's views and beliefs, to attempt to find the solution to today's ills.

These are my personal observations and comments.

Stanley J. Reiben, Counsel

INTRODUCTION

Organization of the Commission

The Commission held its first organizational meeting in New York City on July 14, 1969. It elected a chairman (the Honorable Charles D. Henderson, Assemblyman from Steuben County), a vice-chairman (the Honorable John F. Flynn, Senator from Westchester County) and a secretary (the Honorable William F. Passannante, Assemblyman from New York City).

After agreeing on general procedures, staff requirements and other necessary organizational matters the Commission adopted a policy to guide it in its work.

First, the Commission agreed that its motto would be to "listen and learn" from all who had information or knowledge in the field of campus unrest. It further agreed that it would have no preconceived notions and indeed that the only such notion would be that it would start from scratch to develop its conclusions.

Second, it agreed that a guiding principle of its endeavorswould be an attempt to contribute towards the development of a meaningful framework for the uninterrupted continuity and smooth functioning of our institutions of higher learning. All of its work must be viewed in this light.

Third, it agreed that it was not an investigatory

commission. Rather, its major focus would be to discover the underlying and fundamental causes of campus unrest, stressing that it was a study commission with a fact-finding mission. No individual would get in trouble as a consequence of speaking to the Commission. A frank and open dialogue with individuals and a thorough review of past writings would be pursued to the fullest extent.

And finally, the Commission agreed that its work would be pursued in an atmosphere devoid of political aggrandizement. It would seek no undue publicity; it would not go off on tangential issues; it would indulge in no witch-hunts; and most of all it would protect the image of the greatest educational system in the world. The young people, the faculty, the administrators of these institutions and the people of the State of New York would hopefully benefit from our endeavors.

Specific Legislative Mandates to the Commission

The State Legislature in creating the Commission mandated that the study include, but should not be limited to,

-- "the manner in which incidents of riot and violence originated"

-- "the concern of students for changes in the structure of our institutions of higher education"

-- "illegal acts intended to destroy, rather than reform, our university system"

-- "the proper role of administrators, faculty, alumni, students and government in the university system"

-- "the extent to which individuals and influences outside the academic community contributed to such disorders"

-- "the need for legislation to prevent the recurrence of student unrest and violence"

Various sections of this report will address these and related issues.

Commission Activities

Since its inception this commission has engaged in a variety of activities and pursuits all intended to develop information surrounding the causes of campus unrest. Because of our policy of "no preconceptions" and open methodologies, we have been able to begin to gain a firm understanding of the issues and problems to which our mandates directed us.

The activities of this commission over the past seven months were as follows:

-- There have been working meetings and seminars of all commission members on a monthly basis since its initial organization in July, 1969. Often these meetings were held two or more times during a given month when circumstances so dictated.

-- The commission undertook a survey of the scope of campus unrest directed at the chief administrators of all 212 institutions of higher learning in this state. The results of the survey were carefully compiled and analyzed and are summarily presented in Section III of this report.

-- We have made visits to numerous college and university campuses throughout the state where seminar sessions were held with students, faculty administrators.

-- In following our "listen and learn" motto, this commission has sought and received written responses to specific questions from a large number of college and university administrators, faculty, and students.

-- We have intensively surveyed a sample of twenty-four colleges and universities with respect to (a) aims of the college, (b) the nature of curriculum, (c) the role of faculty, students, administrators, trustees, alumni, government, etc.

-- The Commission held eight open public meetings in all geographic areas of the state. We directly invited the constituents of the colleges in each region and the public at large to attend. At each meeting we listened to an average of thirty speakers and received additional written communications from people who could not attend.

-- We actively solicited and received a wide range of views from the public at large.

-- The Commission initiated a symposium composed of representative students from the various units within the SUNY system.

-- The Commission consulted with a large number of experts who have published documents in the field of student activism and campus unrest.

-- A number of various position papers, discussion papers, and other documents were developed and prepared by the Commission. These are to be published as staff studies at a later date. Among the documents to be published are (a) the transcripts of the public meetings held at Alfred, Buffalo, Syracuse, Potsdam, Hauppaugue, New Rochelle, and New York City, (b) the complete results of the survey of administrators, (c) the selected case studies of campus unrest in New York State, (d) other supporting documents considered to be pertinent

-- We named an advisory panel of distinguished citizens to review our findings to date.

-- The Commission solicited and received reports of national, state, and other study groups conducting inquiries in this area. These were carefully reviewed and analyzed.

-- An extensive survey of the literature was undertaken by commission members.

Additional Areas Requiring More Intensive Study

The very nature of the subject matter of campus unrest--the values of the larger society, the specific goals of individuals and institutions within society, the instruments for effecting social change, the purposes of teaching and learning--is essentially human life itself. We make no claim to have mastered all this. We were only able to touch the surface of these issues in the time available. But we now understand, at least, the vast dimensions of the problems which we were authorized to study. We need to go deeper and to extend our studies into areas still untapped.

-- The impacts of the emerging unrest at the secondary levels require our attention.

-- The entire question of the dimensions and impacts of "Open Admissions" policies must be thoroughly studied and analyzed.

-- The area of student demands, particularly of minority group students requires our thoughtful attention.

-- The impact of the ebb and flow of funds for special research centers and institutes.

-- Other issues this commission should direct its attention to would include:
   a. comprehensive fact-finding in emerging cases of campus unrest
   b. identification of campuses with potential instances of unrest before serious turmoil occurs
   c. public meetings in other regions of the state
   d. methods of collection, distribution, control and accountability of student funds

SECTION I

THE STRUCTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN NEW YORK STATE

It is almost impossible to understand the nature of campus unrest in New York State without some knowledge about the structure of higher education. It is comprised of every conceivable type of administrative arrangements--private, public, combined private and public; a large state system, a large city system and some combined county-state or city-state systems; two-year, four-year and combined graduate-undergraduate-professional; sectarian and non-sectarian; all-male, all-female and co-educational. To say the least, it is a rather complex system indeed.

During 1967-68 a total of 65% of the 222,000 high school graduates of the previous year registered in these institutions of higher learning. (The corresponding percentage 4 years earlier was 57% and 3 years ago it was 60%). Joining with their fellow college mates they added up to a total degree credit enrollment of 639,000. Of these 504,000 were undergraduate and 136,000 were graduate students. They enrolled in a

total of 212 institutions--75 public institutions enrolled 331,000 and 137 private institutions enrolled 309,000. Of the 75 public institutions 59 are part of the State University (SUNY) system and 16 are part of the City University (CUNY) system of the City of New York. 78 of the private institutions are sectarian while 59 are non-sectarian.

The 212 institutions ranged in size of enrollment from a handful in a few cases to as large as 46,000 full and part-time students in one instance. 109 of the institutions enrolled less than 1000 students; 61 enrolled between 1000 and 4000 students while 42 enrolled over 4000 students.

Of the 212 institutions 34 were predominantly male, 30 were predominantly female and 148 were co-educational.

In 31 of the institutions most of the students resided on campus. In 56 institutions most students commuted and the remaining 125 educated both residents and commuters.

66 of the institutions are 2-year colleges while 146 have programs of four or more years. Of the latter, 90 offered graduate studies.

During 1966-67 these institutions conferred a total of 101,000 degrees of various kinds. The 2-year college conferred 21,000 associate degrees. The remaining institu- conferred 53,000 bachelors degrees; 24,000 masters or professional degrees and 3,000 doctorates. Approximately 90%

of the doctorates were conferred by a dozen institutions.

The 212 institutions employed a total of 30,000 full-time faculty, a supporting staff of 100,000 full and part-time people and spent $1.4 billion on current account. About 30% of the revenues came from student fees, 24% from direct state and local government grants and 17% from federal sources.

No reliable data on the general social characteristics of the student population exists. However, a recent census of the ethnic composition was made by the State Education Department. In the fall of 1968 the full-time enrollment of black students approximated 13,000. About 5,000 enrolled in private institutions and 8,000 in public institutions. All units of City University of New York combined enrolled about 5,000. Of 19 colleges throughout the state which enrolled 225 or more black students 15 are located in New York City and 8 of these are units of CUNY. In addition there are approximately 2000 Puerto Rican students and 250 American Indians attending the colleges and universities in this state. Almost all the Puerto Rican students attend institutions located in New York City.

SECTION II

CAMPUS UNREST AS A NATIONAL PHENOMENON

Background

Campus unrest has come to be a regular part of the college scene during the 1960's. It is manifested in differing forms and varying intensities. It not only transcends the boundaries of New York State but also of the nation as well. In the past decade it has occurred in such distant places as Japan, France, England, Germany.

However, disturbances on the campuses are by no means peculiar to the 1960's. For centuries European universities have been centers of student activism and were often ravaged by the more extreme instances of unrest. In the past century many institutions in this nation were rocked to their foundations by student activists. A striking example of this was during the Civil War when the New York City draft riots spread to the campus of Columbia University and threatened the actual physical existance of that institution.

The unrest on the campuses in the sixties, however, is in striking contrast to earlier periods and even to the

relatively calm campuses of the thirties, forties and fifties. The resurgence of student activism during the 1960's is the product of many complex and interwoven factors. The task here, however, is not to analyze these factors but to present a brief overview of some of the more significant instances of campus unrest in the past decade to demonstrate (a) that it is a national phenomenon, (b) that its most serious occurrences involved institutions that employ the most prestigious faculty and attract the academically most talented students and (c) that New York State as a national leader in higher education could well expect its large quota of unrest during that decade.

In terms of form and tactics much of the unrest can be linked to the Civil Rights movement of the early 1960's. As early as February of 1960 black students in the South were sitting in at segregated lunch counters in order to challenge Southern Jim-Crow laws. Northern white students soon joined the movement which expanded to include wider issues such as the right to vote. The Mississippi Summer Projects of 1964 in which whites and blacks worked together to register black voters served as a training ground for future student activists. And the methods of the movement--marches, vigils, sit-ins, picketing--proved somewhat successful against over-

whelming odds.

The Academy in Turmoil

One of the illustrious graduates of the Summer Project was the Berkeley chairman of the Friends of SNCC, Mario Savio. Savio emerged later as the pre-eminent leader of what came to be known as the Free Speech Movement (FSM) at the University of California at Berkeley. It was the activities of the FSM which signal the beginnings of widespread campus revolt during the 1960's. The initial issues involved a challenge of the university's right to ban students from engaging in political activity on campus property. It escalated to include suspension of students followed by challenges to the suspensions by faculty and students through protests, demonstrations, strikes and building occupation.

Confrontations occurred at Berkeley and elsewhere between 1964 and 1968. But the conflagration at San Francisco State College in the Spring of 1968 was one of the most notorious in the nation. It had all the elements of disruption --protests concerning external matters such as ROTC and civil rights, demonstrations for internal reforms including a black studies program, strong police action, mass arrests, widespread publicity.

San Francisco State demonstrated that a "hard line" did not necessarily produce instant quiet.

In February of 1969 the University of Wisconsin underwent a disruption that closely resembled San Francisco State both in student demands and official reaction. Wisconsin had already weathered protests in 1967 and 1968 but in 1969 the black students demanded a black studies department controlled by black students and faculty, the admission of 500 more black students by September and a black official to help in the financial aid office. When the University refused, demonstrators roamed the campus disrupting classes. The number of protesters and police escalated until Governor Knowles sent in 900 National Guard troops to restore order. The troops departed after three days.

The issues at the University of Chicago were university expansion into the black Woodlawn area and recruitment of low income blacks as freshmen and an SDS demand that a dismissed sociology professor be reinstated. The administration building was occupied for sixteen days.

No police were called in. At the same time no concessions were made by the university.

At Harvard University in April of 1969, 300 militants seized the administration building, forcibly ejecting several school deans and demanding the abolition of ROTC and no increase in the rent in University housing. The administration used 400 police to clear the building. After 197 arrests and 40 injuries moderate students, who disagreed with the militants' tactics but supported their demands, voted a three day student-faculty strike, condemned the University for its use of police and requested amnesty for those arrested. The faculty, especially that of the School of Arts and Sciences, essentially supported this position.

The strike was extended for another three days on the basis of proposals for restructuring discipline procedures, eliminating ROTC and setting up a black studies program. Jumping on the bandwagon the black students presented their demands to the University for black student representation on a faculty-student committee to control the new black studies program. The faculty voted to stop ROTC as soon as it was legally possible.

The importance of the unrest at Harvard was not the demands of the students or the reaction of the administration but the fact that it occurred in the oldest and probably the most prestigious university in the nation.

The prime exponent of the campaign against defense

research was the November protests at M.I.T.. A group known as the November Action Coalition organized protests against the school for engaging in war research. Even before a march had been staged the University, with faculty support, obtained a court injuction forbidding violence or the threat of violence in any demonstration. Although outsiders were involved, the main force of the subsequent marches and protests appeared to be M.I.T. students, one of whom was arrested when police broke up a protest at the request of Cambridge officials. Activity was temporarily abated after five days when a panel at the school agreed to eliminate secret research, finish the government contracts which comprise one half of the M.I.T. budget and attempt to move into research dealing with human, not military, problems. The radicals in the Coalition considered this inadequate and demonstrations were resumed in January of 1970.

The drive for equal rights, voter registration, justice for all and other civil liberties for Black Americans played a role in the student protest in the early 60's. By the end of the decade university reform and the war in Viet Nam joined the race issue as the issues voiced by students at the leading universities throughout the nation. At Berkeley, Wisconsin, Chicago, Harvard, M.I.T. student activists protested the discrepancy between the claims of government and

university officials about equality, the human condition, millions of poor in an affluent society, racial prejudice and the war in Viet Nam. But underneath it all there is a common thread of student or faculty challenge of the long established rules and perogatives of the traditional university administration power. Columbia, Cornell, N.Y.U. and other institutions of higher learning in New York State likewise joined in the fray.

Legislative Responses to Campus Unrest

As the frequency and intensity of student unrest and disruptions at college and university campuses grew legislators around the nation turned their attention to these problems. We present here a brief summary of some of the legislative actions.

Of those forty-nine state legislatures which met in 1969, some thirty-six considered legislation related to campus disorders. Measures were enacted in twenty of these states; defeated, vetoed or ruled unconstitutional in ten others; the remainder were still in session at the time this information was gathered.

Inasmuch as a great deal of legislation, both proposed and enacted, was similar in nature we grouped them into six major categories.

-- Curtailment of financial aids to disruptive students

-- Punishment of students and other members of the academic community who engage in disruptive activities

-- Prohibition of the use and possession of firearms on college campuses

-- Establishment of rules of conduct for the students and others on campus

-- Curtailment of the activities of disruptive non-students and limiting out-of-state students

-- Creation of study or investigatory groups on student disorders

The following tables indicate the states which either considered or actually enacted legislation of various kinds on campus unrest. In addition to the types of legislation mentioned above, there was a host of miscellaneous bills introduced in the past year directed at the problems of student unrest and campus disorders. Some examples include:

-- A bill passed by Colorado's senate giving police powers to campus security forces

-- A bill passed by one house of the New Jersey legislature allowing students to sue other students who keep them from attending classes

-- A resolution passed by the Kansas legislature calling for no change in ROTC programs

-- A bill was considered in North Dakota's legislature which would curb the use of obscene language in student publications

-- New Mexico considered a bill which would limit the appropriation to the State University to $1 unless certain teachers were fired

In New York State in 1969 more than 30 bills in this field were considered by the Legislature. Only 3 however were enacted into law--banning of firearms on campus, filing rules of conduct including due process procedures and establishment of a commission to study the causes of campus unrest. In the context of the nationwide response New York State appears to have followed a remarkable course of moderation.

TABLE A

STATES WHICH PROPOSED LEGISLATION CONCERNING
STUDENT UNREST AND CAMPUS DISORDERS
IN SIX SELECTED MAJOR CATEGORIES -- 1969

Curtailment of financial aids	Punishment for disruptive activities	Prohibition of firearms on campus
California	Alabama	Alabama
Connecticut	Arkansas	Massachusetts
Illinois	California	New Jersey
Iowa	Colorado	New York
Maryland	Connecticut	Pennsylvania
Massachusetts	Delaware	South Carolina
Michigan	Florida	
New Hampshire	Idaho	
New Jersey	Illinois	
New York	Indiana	
Pennsylvania	Iowa	
Rhode Island	Louisiana	
Washington	Maryland	
Wisconsin	Massachusetts	
	Michigan	
	Minnesota	
	Missouri	
	Montana	
	Nevada	
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	North Dakota	
	Ohio	
	Oklahoma	
	Oregon	
	South Carolina	
	Tennessee	
	Texas	
	Utah	
	Washington	
	West Virginia	
	Wisconsin	

TABLE A (cont.)

Establishment of rules of conduct	Curtailment of Non-students and out-of-state students	Creation of study and investigatory commissions
California	Alabama	Maryland
Illinois	California	New Jersey
Florida	Colorado	New Mexico
Montana	Florida	New York
New York	Illinois	Washington
North Dakota	Indiana	
	Louisiana	
	Maryland	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	North Dakota	
	Oklahoma	
	Oregon	
	Tennessee	
	Texas	
	West Virginia	
	Wisconsin	

TABLE B

STATES WHICH ENACTED LAWS CONCERNING STUDENT UNREST AND CAMPUS DISORDERS IN SIX SELECTED MAJOR CATEGORIES -- 1969

Curtailment of financial aids	Punishment for disruptive activities	Prohibition of firearms on campus
Illinois	Colorado	Massachusetts
Iowa	Delaware	New Jersey
Washington	Florida	New York
	Idaho	
	Louisiana	
	Missouri	
	New Mexico	
	North Dakota	
	Oklahoma	
	Oregon	
	Tennessee	

Establishment of rules of conduct	Curtailment of non-student and out-of-state students	Creation of study and investigatory commissions
Florida	Colorado	New Jersey
New York	Maryland	New Mexico
North Dakota	North Dakota	New York
	Oklahoma	
	Tennessee	
	Wisconsin	

Section III

THE SCOPE OF CAMPUS UNREST IN NEW YORK STATE, 1967-69

Introduction

This section represents an analysis of responses by chief college administrators to a questionnaire entitled "Preliminary Status Survey of College Unrest for the Academic Years 1967-68 and 1968-69." The questionnaire was mailed to the 212 institutions of higher learning within the State of New York. Responses were received from 202 institutions. The non-respondents tended to be a few small sectarian colleges or theological seminaries.

The major focus of the survey was to seek answers to certain questions. What is the extent of the unrest? In what types of institutions is it concentrated? How severe is the unrest? Are there any particular characteristics which identify these institutions? Other areas examined included the number of students involved, the characteristics of these students, the issues they espoused, the degree of violence to persons or damage to property that accompanied the unrest, the role of faculty and the extent of the influence of organizations on the unrest.

Inasmuch as the concept of campus unrest has come to mean all things to all men it was deliberately left undefined in the survey. This means that each administrator used his own definition of what was meant by unrest. As a checking device, however, we asked each one to group the type of unrest under four categories--no unrest, intellectual ferment, demonstrations and direct confrontations. As a further check we asked for a judgment of the severity--not severe, healthy dissent, somewhat harmful disruption or critical disruption--of the unrest.

Institutions with no Unrest or with Intellectual Ferment

These institutions were 110 in number or 54.4% of the total surveyed.

46.4% said the unrest was not severe, 48.2% said the unrest was healthy dissent and only 5.5% said the unrest was somewhat harmful (See Table 1).

They constituted

-- 61.3% of the two-year State University of New York (SUNY) units

-- 34.8% of the four-year SUNY units

-- 33.3% of two-year City University of New York (CUNY) units

-- 30% of the four-year CUNY units

-- 83.3% of the two-year non-sectarian units

-- 49.1% of the four-year non-sectarian units

-- 31.8% of the two-year sectarian units

-- 62.2% of the four-year sectarian units

They also represented

-- 46.5% of all the public institutions

-- 58.9% of all the private institutions (See Table 2)

They constituted

-- 78.8% of all the small schools

-- 41.0% of all the medium ones

-- 16.7% of the larger ones (See Table 3)

These schools comprised

-- 73.6% of the all-male colleges

-- 56.7% of the all-female ones

-- 49.2% of the coed schools (See Table 4)

Furthermore these schools constituted

-- 71% of the all-residential schools

-- 60.7% of the all commuter schools

-- 46.9% of those schools which have both residential and commuter students (See Table 5)

Institutions with Unrest Categorized as Demonstrations

Colleges and universities within the state which experienced some unrest which might be categorized as "demonstrations" (such as picketing, rallies, teach-ins, sit-ins, boycotts etc.) were 66 in number or 32.7% of all institutions (See Table 1)

62.1% said the unrest was healthy dissent and 37.9% said the unrest was somewhat harmful (See Table 1)

They constituted

-- 38.2% of the two-year SUNY units

-- 43.5% of the four-year SUNY units

-- 16.7% of the two-year CUNY units

-- 40.0% of the four-year CUNY units

-- 16.7% of the two-year non-sectarian units

-- 35.6% of the four-year non-sectarian units

-- 9.1% of the two-year sectarian units

-- 28.3% of the four-year sectarian units (See Table 2)

They also represented

-- 38.4% of the public institutions

-- 29.5% of the private ones (See Table 2)

They constituted

-- 15.2% of all the small schools

-- 50.8% of all the medium ones

-- 47.6% of all the larger ones (See Table 3)

These schools comprised

-- 11.8% of the all-male colleges

-- 40% of the all-female colleges

-- 36.2% of the coed institutions (See Table 4)

Furthermore these colleges and universities constituted

-- 19.4% of the all-residential schools

-- 30.4% of the all-commuter schools

-- 37.4% of the institutions having both commuter and residential students (See Table 5)

Institutions with Unrest Categorized As Direct Confrontations

The institutions with unrest categorized as direct confrontations (such as forceful occupation of buildings, disruption of classes, etc.) were 26 in number or 12.9% of all the colleges and universities.

3.8% of their administrators termed the unrest as healthy dissent, 65.4% of their administrators termed the unrest somewhat harmful and 30.8% of their administrators termed the unrest a critical disruption (See Table 1).

They constituted

-- none of the two-year SUNY units

-- 21.7% of the four-year SUNY units

-- 50% of the two-year CUNY units

-- 30% of the four-year CUNY units

-- none of the two-year non-sectarian units

-- 15.3% of the four-year non-sectarian units

-- 9.1% of the two-year sectarian units

-- 9.4% of the four-year sectarian units (See Table 2)

They constituted

-- 6.1% of all the small schools

-- 8.2% of all the medium sized schools

-- 35.7% of all the larger ones

Put another way, of the 26 colleges and universities having direct confrontations

-- 23.1% were small

-- 19.2% were medium

-- 57.7% were large (See Table 3)

These schools comprised

-- 14.7% of the all-male colleges

-- 3.3% of the all-female colleges

-- 14.5% of the coed institutions (See Table 4)

They also constituted

-- 9.7% of the all-residential schools

-- 8.9% of the all-commuter schools

-- 15.7% of those institutions having both commuter and residential students (See Table 5)

General Conclusions

Institutions which experienced little or no unrest constituted slightly in excess of half of the colleges and universities in the state. Generally speaking these institutions are:

-- Two-year institutions--junior colleges, community colleges, agricultural and technical colleges--with the possible exception of those in New York City

-- Four-year sectarian colleges

-- All male or all female colleges

-- Small (under 1000 enrollment) institutions

-- All residential or all commuter schools

No one of these characteristics is necessary or sufficient to identify lack of unrest. However, when taken in the appropriate combinations they become potent indicators of lack of unrest.

Institutions which experienced serious cases of unrest constituted 26 of the 212 colleges and universities. Moreover, only 8 of these considered the unrest to be critically disruptive of college and university functions. Generally speaking these are:

-- Large institutions

-- Institutions with programs of 4 or more years

-- Located in urban areas or draw a good number of students from urban areas

All along the continuum between these two extremes--no unrest and critical disruption--are the remaining 33% of the colleges and universities in the state. These institutions experience some measure of unrest ranging from healthy dissent to somewhat harmful disruption. In general they are:

-- Medium to large in size

-- All-female or coed institutions

-- Of a combined residential and commuter student body

-- Located in all areas of the state

Other Conclusions From the Survey

The Students and the Issues. The relative numbers of students involved in any given case of campus unrest appears to be quite small, usually under 5%.

They tended to be enrolled in either the social sciences or humanities, with an orientation toward the liberal arts. They are generally the average and above-average students. Finally all class levels were represented, but the sophomores seem to be the most usually represented.

The larger social issues appeared to concern them more than the personal conduct issues or academic concerns. The larger social issues that were in the forefront of their concerns tended to be the war in Viet Nam and racism. The personal conduct issue and the academic concern that was most frequently mentioned was student role in administration. Another academic concern that was mentioned frequently enough to be noteworthy was curriculum content.

Intensity, Duration, Influence of Faculty and Role of Organizations. Regarding the intensity, duration, influence of faculty and the role of organizations as they re-

late to campus unrest, some generalizations can be made from the survey results.

-- The violence to persons, damage to property and involuntary stoppage of classes that have accompanied incidents of campus unrest appear to be of a minimal nature. It should be recognized that violence associated with campus unrest occurred on 11 or 5.5% of the campuses surveyed. Furthermore, these incidents were predominately confined to institutions experiencing direct confrontations. Also it should be noted that almost all demonstrations and majority of direct confrontations did not yield acts of violence or involuntary stoppages of classes.

-- Generally speaking an overwhelming majority of the unrest lasted for 5 days or less (in 120 out of the 150 campuses that had any unrest at all, including intellectual ferment). In 14 instances (7 of which were among the 26 direct confrontations) the unrest endured more than 25 days. Very few class days were lost as a result of the unrest; 187 or 92.6% of the colleges reported no class days lost and 2 colleges reported more than 10 class days lost.

-- The influence of faculty is a difficult factor to evaluate from the information received. While 35.6% of the institutions responding to the survey felt that their faculty did play an active (either contributing or restraining) role in the unrest the extent of that role is not clear.

-- The role of faculty and organizations also tended to be minimal. In the case of student organizations, however, SDS and student governments were mentioned an equal number of times.

Administrative Arrangements for Handling Campus Unrest. Finally the survey requested the colleges and universities to provide some information about any administrative arrangements they have for handling campus unrest. There were ques-

tions regarding the existance of a grievance machinery, the effective elements within it, the critical factors for calling the police onto campus, whether a new grievance machinery could be developed and what would be the critical elements in such a machinery. Some general comments follow:

-- a majority of the colleges and universities within the state do have some machinery for handling grievances.

-- The effective elements of such a machinery appears to be both good communication and student participation in the decision making process.

-- In general off-campus authorities would be called only in the last resort when life or property was threatened.

-- The major critical element in any new machinery was felt to be increased communications.

TABLE 1

TYPE OF CAMPUS UNREST RELATED TO SEVERITY OF THE UNREST

(Number and Percentage of Colleges)

TYPE OF UNREST	SEVERITY				
	Not Severe (No Unrest)	Healthy Dissent	Somewhat Harmful	Critical Disruption	Totals
NONE	45 88.2%	7 7.4%	0 0	0 0	52 25.7%
INTELLECTUAL FERMENT	6 11.8%	46 48.4%	6 12.5%	0 0	58 28.7%
DEMONSTRATIONS	0 0	41 43.2%	25 52.1%	0 0	66 32.7%
DIRECT CONFRONTATIONS	0 0	1 1.1%	17 35.4%	8 100%	26 12.9%
TOTALS	51 100%	95 100%	48 100%	8 100%	202 100%

TABLE 2
TYPE OF CAMPUS UNREST
RELATED TO TYPES OF COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION
(Number and Percentage of Colleges)

TYPE OF UNREST	TYPES OF COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION														
	SUNY			CUNY			Total Public	NON-SECTARIAN			SECTARIAN			Total Private	Total State
	2 Year	4 Year or More	Total SUNY	2 Year	4 Year or More	Total CUNY		2 Year	4 Year or More	Total Non-Sectarian	2 Year	4 Year or More	Total Sectarian		
NONE	12 35.3%	2 8.7%	14 24.6%	0	1 10.0%	1 6.3%	15 20.5%	2 33.3%	14 23.7%	16 24.6%	7 63.6%	14 26.4%	21 32.8%	37 28.7%	52 25.7%
INTELLECT-UAL FERMENT	9 26.5%	6 26.1%	15 26.3%	2 33.3%	2 20.0%	4 25.0%	19 26.0%	3 50.0%	15 25.4%	18 27.7%	2 18.2%	19 35.8%	21 32.8%	39 30.2%	58 28.7%
DEMONSTRA-TIONS	13 38.2%	10 43.5%	23 40.3%	1 16.7%	4 40.0%	5 31.3%	28 38.4%	1 16.7%	21 35.6%	22 33.9%	1 9.1%	15 28.3%	16 25.0%	38 29.5%	66 32.7%
DIRECT CONFRONTA-TIONS	0	5 21.7%	5 8.8%	3 50.0%	3 30.0%	6 37.4%	11 15.1%	0	9 15.3%	9 13.8%	1 9.1%	5 9.4%	6 9.4%	15 11.6%	26 12.9%
TOTAL	34 100%	23 100%	57 100%	6 100%	10 100%	16 100%	73 100%	6 100%	59 100%	65 100%	11 100%	53 100%	64 100%	129 100%	202 100%

TABLE 3

TYPE OF CAMPUS UNREST RELATED TO SIZE OF INSTITUTION

(Number and Percentage of Colleges)

TYPE OF UNREST	SIZE OF INSTITUTION			
	Small Under 1000	Medium 1000-4000	Large Over 4000	Totals
NONE	43 43.4%	9 14.8%	0	52 25.7%
INTELLECTUAL FERMENT	35 35.4%	16 26.2%	7 16.7%	58 28.7%
DEMONSTRATIONS	15 15.2%	31 50.8%	20 47.6%	66 32.7%
DIRECT CONFRONTATIONS	6 6.1%	5 8.2%	15 35.7%	26 12.9%
TOTALS	99 100%	61 100%	42 100%	202 100%

TABLE 4

TYPE OF CAMPUS UNREST RELATED TO SEX OF STUDENTS
(Number and Percentage of Colleges)

TYPE OF UNREST	SEX OF STUDENTS			
	All Male	All Female	Coed	Totals
NONE	14 41.2%	8 26.7%	30 21.7%	52 25.7%
INTELLECTUAL FERMENT	11 32.4%	9 30%	38 27.5%	58 28.7%
DEMONSTRATIONS	4 11.8%	12 40%	50 36.2%	66 32.7%
DIRECT CONFRONTATIONS	5 14.7%	1 3.3%	20 14.5%	26 12.9%
TOTALS	34 100%	30 100%	138 100%	202 100%

TABLE 5

TYPE OF UNREST RELATED TO RESIDENTIAL STATUS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

(Number and Percentage of Colleges)

TYPE OF UNREST	Residential Status of Students			
	All Residential	All Commuter	Both Residential and Commuter	Totals
NONE	11 35.5%	19 33.9%	22 19.1%	52 25.7%
INTELLECTUAL FERMENT	11 35.5%	15 26.8%	32 27.8%]	58 28.7%
DEMONSTRATIONS	6 19.4%	17 30.4%	43 37.4%	66 32.7%
DIRECT CONFRONTATIONS	3 9.7%	5 8.9%	18 15.7%	26 12.9%
TOTALS	31 100%	56 100%	115 100%	202 100%

SECTION IV

SELECTED CASE STUDIES OF CAMPUS UNREST IN NEW YORK STATE

Mild Cases of Student Unrest

Most colleges and universities in New York State have not experienced serious disruptions of school activities. But some form of unrest involving students and sometimes faculty is common. Such unrest is often regarded as healthy dissent reflecting intellectual ferment of students exposed to new ideas in the learning process and in the world around them. Associated with this phenomenon are comparatively low-keyed protests including orderly "teach-ins".

At the State University College at Oswego in April 1969, for example, about 1,000 students participated in a "bitch-in" aimed at neutralizing anti-war protests. SUNY officials regarded the incident as generally positive in nature.

Rallies and picketing have been used at many colleges and universities in the state to effect changes in campus rules and to draw attention to grievances related to social issues. Incidents at two State University campuses

are representative of this dimension of unrest.

At Oneonta in 1968 about 20 freshman coeds staged a "sit-out" over the curfew then in effect. The group sought the same privileges as upperclass women and male students. No vital activities at the college were disrupted.

At Binghamton in the fall of 1969 students and local residents joined in protesting a school proposal to fill in a swampy area for a road and parking facilities. Opposition was based on ecological concerns. The administration agreed to review its plan.

Although the situation did not get out of hand in the vast majority of campus protests there were, nevertheless, some very serious confrontations. At their worst they involved critical disruptions of the usual college activities as well as extensive damage to property.

The Commission study included analyses of all types of campus unrest, ranging from the orderly teach-ins to disturbances that resulted in police intervention and court action. Rather than present all types of cases we believe that the basic dimensions of campus unrest in New York can be gauged by incidents at 10 campuses since the start of the 1967-68 academic year. Arranged on the basis of historical sequence the institutions are

Colgate, Columbia, Alfred, Queens College, State University Center at Buffalo, State University Center at Stony Brook, Cornell, City University of New York, Queensborough Community College and Vassar.

Some Serious Cases of Unrest

Colgate University. At the time of the national outpouring of emotion over the assassination of Martin Luther King in April 1968 the Administration Building at Colgate was taken over for 100 hours in a protest aimed at ending discrimination by some fraternities at the university. Two black students who were outside the all-white Sigma Nu house were challenged in the early-morning hours of Palm Sunday. It was reported that shots were fired in the dark from upstairs windows. These turned out to be blanks from a starter's pistol.

Members of the Association of Black Collegians (ABC) demanded suspension of Sigma Nu. Vincent M. Barnett Jr., then Colgate president, acceded. But on Tuesday the ABC called for revocation of the Phi Delta Theta charter and the closing of the house as a living unit on the ground that the fraternity pledged no black students.

The Phi Delts agreed to end membership restrictions based on race, but the blacks also wanted underclassmen living in the house dispersed. This demand was rejected

and a sit-in at the Administration Building began on Wednesday with significant support from white students and faculty.

The orderly sit-in continued until Easter Sunday when a compromise was worked out.

Columbia University. Columbia University was brought to a standstill in April 1968 because of a protest demonstration that lasted for a week, resulting in the takeover of five buildings by an estimated 700 to 1,000 persons.

The disturbance began on April 23, when the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) chapter called a rally to protest the university's affiliation with the Institute for Defense Analyses--a consortium doing research related to national defense and domestic riot control--and President Grayson Kirk's ban on all indoor demonstrations at Columbia.

One group of demonstrators clashed with city police at a nearby public park where the university planned to build a new gymnasium. The project was opposed by some blacks in Harlem who resented Columbia's expansion into their community. The gym also was portrayed as a symbol of racism since there was to be a separate entrance for community residents.

Initially, an SDS contingent and black Columbia students occupied Hamilton Hall. The two groups had a falling out, however, and the whites were evicted. They forced their way into nearby Low Library early Wednesday. During the next several days, three more buildings were seized.

The demands made on the administration by the demonstrators were:

-- Dropping disciplinary probation against six students cited for violating the indoor-demonstration ban

-- Rescinding the ban on indoor demonstrations

-- Making all campus judicial decisions in open hearings

-- Severing Columbia's ties with the Institute for Defense Analyses

-- Halting construction of the gymnasium

-- Granting amnesty to those who had been in the gymnasium demonstration on April 23

On April 30 the administration asked city police to clear the five occupied buildings. The so-called "bust" by police ended with about 700 persons under arrest, of which about 100 were non-students. In addition, an estimated 100 demonstrators, onlookers and police were injured in the resistance and general confusion that accompanied the police action.

Alfred University. The annual ROTC review held on Parents Day at Alfred was the target of a protest by 16 demonstrators who forced a test of the university's recently imposed demonstration guidelines.

On May 11, 1968 the demonstrators appeared on the athletic field with protest signs related to the then compulsory ROTC program, the Vietnam war and the needs of black students. The university dean declared that they were obstructing the scheduled exercises and ordered them to conform to the guidelines by leaving the field. Eight of the group obeyed the directive. The others, including a faculty member, did not and were suspended.

The suspended students took their case to Federal Court in Buffalo. Their lawyer argued that the Alfred administration had restricted their constitutionally guaranteed right of expression by requiring them to give 48 hours notice of a demonstration. The U. S. Court of Appeals upheld the disputed provision and said the advance notice requirement was in the best interests of the university.

Queens College. Queens College a part of the City University of New York (CUNY) system, experienced disruptions in the 1968-69 school year related to the remedial SEEK

(Search for Elevation, Education and Knowledge) program and to recruitment on the campus by private companies.

SEEK participants wanted the program to be totally autonomous and expressed fear that it was instead to be submerged into the existing college structure. Disruptions related to this concern occurred in early January. President Joseph McMurray, fearing that violence would occur, closed the institution for two days.

On March 11, 1969 a recruiter for General Electric who was to have interviewed students about possible employment decided against trying to conduct the interviews because of disruptions by other students. Three students were charged with violating the college rules on dissent. The Student Court recommended their suspension for refusing to abide by its procedures but later reversed itself.

Subsequently, about 200 persons staged a sit-in in the Social Sciences Building to force the college to drop all charges against the three students, to rehire an assistant professor whose contract had not been renewed and to repudiate the so-called Max-Kahn Report containing guidelines for retaining personnel in the CUNY system.

Police were summoned to end the sit-in. 39 persons, including a faculty member, were arrested and charged with criminal trespass.

More disturbances related to the SEEK demands and the arrests followed, however, and police were summoned to clear the campus a second time in early May.

State University of New York at Buffalo. Students took over Hayes Hall, the administration building at the State University Center in Buffalo, late on the afternoon of March 19, 1969 and remained inside the building until shortly after 7 the next morning. Approximately 140 demonstrators evacuated the building in an orderly fashion after President Martin Meyerson obtained a restraining order.

Emotions had been running high as the result of the sentencing in Buffalo of a non-student who had been convicted of assault in connection with a draft-resistance protest. Some students had demonstrated outside the courthouse. An estimated 60 of these students marched to the Project Themis construction site after returning to the campus. The Themis project was resented by some because the Defense Department funded it. Three sheds at the site were destroyed.

Later, about 130 students converged on Hayes Hall and eventually set up barricades. President Meyerson met with the group for about two hours before getting a court order.

Six stated demands resulted from the protest:

-- An end to all contracting of defense research on the campus, including an immediate halt to the Themis project.

-- Abolition of the ROTC program at the university.

-- Amnesty for those who had participated in the building takeover and action at Themis site.

-- A fully integrated work force in the construction of the university's new campus in suburban Amherst.

-- Open admissions for the youth of poor families, especially blacks and "third world" peoples.

-- Creation of a "workers college" to be controlled by students in that college.

The State University of New York at Stony Brook. The State University campus at Stony Brook, scene of a headline-making drug raid in January 1968, experienced seven disturbances between March of that year and May 1969. Student complaints were rooted in what was regarded as interference with campus freedom by administrators and off-campus police.

The fifth--and at the time most serious--incident in the series occurred on March 2, 1969. A rally was held to protest the arrests of a university sophomore and a former Stony Brook student who had been banned from

the campus. The rally turned into a sit-in at the school library and administrative offices. Many of the occupants were persuaded to leave the building, but the rest were cleared by Suffolk County police who were summoned by President Toll. Twenty-one demonstrators were arrested and sentenced to 15-day jail terms for loitering.

Demands made at that time included abolishing the status of persona non grata and dropping charges against persons so classified.

On May 13, 1969 an estimated 1,000 students went on a brief rampage that resulted in $25,000 damage to windows and a gatehouse that was burned down. The grievance in this case was another drug raid carried out by county police who had arrested 14 students. On May 16 student activists cut telephone lines and broke into research files in an hour-long outburst.

Cornell University. Willard Straight Hall, the student union at Cornell University, was taken over for 36 hours by black students during the Parents Day weekend of April 19-20, 1969. At the heart of the turmoil were charges of racism made by the blacks.

The university had been increasing the number of minority-group students since 1963. But the administration's efforts to eradicate fraternity discrimination and its willingness to

provide separate living quarters for blacks who preferred this arrangement were overshadowed by the claim that there was foot-dragging in the creation of a black-studies program.

A group of black students staged comparatively minor disruptions in December 1968, and six of them were cited under the student code. It was not until April 18, however, that three of the six were reprimanded.

The judicial decision was followed by the burning of a cross on the porch of the residence for black coeds. On April 19 an estimated 80 blacks took over the student union to force nullification of the reprimands and to get an investigation of the cross-burning.

Tensions were heightened during the day when a group of white students tried to break into the occupied building. Rumors circulated that armed whites planned to oust the blacks. The blacks then got weapons of their own.

A day later, an agreement was worked out under which the demonstrators--carrying guns they said were needed for protection--left the building. The blacks agreed to cooperate in devising a new judicial system at the university.

But the agreement hinged on the Cornell faculty reviewing the original judicial decisions. They declined to nullify them at a special meeting on April 21, causing widespread anger. The nullifications were approved two days later, however, and a sweeping revision of campus governance then was begun.

City College of New York. When an estimated 75 black and Puerto Rican students began a "lock-in" at City College of New York on April 22, 1969 they focused dramatically on one of the most difficult questions facing educators and society in general. How does one balance the demands of minority groups for more educational opportunities for which they are often not prepared with the desire of administrators, faculty and other students to keep academic standards at the highest possible level?

In the case of CCNY, the student demonstration grew out of five demands:

-- a separate orientation program for incoming black and Puerto Rican students

-- a degree-granting school of black and Puerto Rican studies

-- greater autonomy for participants in the remedial SEEK program

-- assurance that CCNY's student body would have the same ethnic composition as the city's high school system

-- a requirement that students in CCNY's School of Education acquire proficiency in black and Puerto Rican heritages and in Spanish

President Buell Gallagher decided to close the entire school while working to reach an agreement with the demonstrators. His tactic was opposed by many faculty and students. It was, however, a court action initiated by two city officials

that forced him to end the shutdown which lasted two weeks.

Gallagher stepped down as president in early May, saying "a man of peace...must stand aside." He was succeeded by Joseph J. Copeland, a CCNY biology professor who had been involved in the negotiations with the demonstrators.

In June New York City's Board of Higher Education rejected the "dual admissions" plan calling for the admission of all high-school graduates who want further education into some CUNY program.

Queensborough Community College. From mid-April through early May of 1969 a small group of students and faculty carried out a series of actions that led to a clear-cut test of the limits of dissent that would be tolerated by the administration of Queensborough Community College--a two-year branch of the City University of New York.

On April 16 the Faculty Council reaffirmed its 1967 policy on student demonstrations. There was a prompt challenge to it, however, when an estimated 600 students, joined by a few faculty members, occupied part of the college library-administration building. Police were called, but no arrests were made. The focal point for the action was President Schmeller's announcement that he could not reappoint a faculty member who had been filling for a tenured teacher then on a leave of absence.

Another sit-in followed. This time the administration obtained a court order, and 31 persons were arrested and charged with criminal trespass. Meanwhile, three faculty members were told that they were being dismissed for unprofessional conduct because of their involvement in the protests. The three faculty members and one student were found guilty of violating the court order and were sentenced to jail terms and fined for contempt. Last September most of the arrested demonstrators pleaded guilty in Criminal Court to the trespass charges and drew sentences ranging up to 15 days in jail and fines of up to $250.

Vassar College. On Oct. 30, 1969 about half of Vassar's 59 black coeds quietly moved into Main Hall to force administrative action on nine demands. The college already had approved a minor in black studies. But the demonstrators wanted the program expanded and called for the hiring of a black counselor and the funding of an urban center in Poughkeepsie.

The building occupation continued for nearly 70 hours without any disruption of classes for the majority of Vassar students. There was significant concern, however, over the presence of about 10 black male students from other colleges who stationed themselves at the door of the building and an undetermined number of other outsiders apparently drawn to the campus by accounts of the demonstration.

An agreement was reached after a series of meetings involving students, faculty, administrators and trustees. Under the accord an interdisciplinary program was created so that students could major in black studies. The only demand rejected was one calling for a separate dormitory for blacks.

Section V

SOME OBSERVATIONS FROM THE CASE STUDIES

The Manner in Which Incidents of Campus Unrest Originate

Based on disturbances analyzed by the Commission some patterns emerge concerning the manner in which incidents of campus unrest originate. The outline does not apply to all colleges and universities. But it is a way of viewing the progression from vague stirrings of dissent common to many campuses to the disorders that have occurred on some of them.

1. There are periods of indefinite duration during which real or imagined grievances build up. The grievances felt by many young people are varied and are related to both societal ills and campus conditions. Underlying this are such considerations as the fact that:

   -- More young people from more varied backgrounds are competing to get into institutions of higher learning and testing ideas once they are there.

   -- They are exceptionally well informed about national and international events because of direct contact with social and political movements and constant exposure to news coverage, especially on television.

   -- They live in a world revolutionized by science and technology in which change is the order of the day, making it seem that almost anything is possible if one really wants to bring it about.

-- Larger numbers of young people have enjoyed affluence and have the time, money and perhaps the spiritual need to espouse causes and help the less advantaged.

When students are sensitive and idealistic they are deeply offended by unpleasant realities. They are conscious of a war of which the nation is weary and delays--despite the pronouncements of public leaders--in making equality a reality for all men.

But those who sense that wrongs go unrighted often are limited to striking back at what is handy--the university from which they were told to expect so much--and issues that are their size--research and ROTC on the campus rather than militarism in general and admissions policies rather than racism in general.

This is especially likely when students' experiences in the university do not come up to the expectations that they had beforehand, when faculty do not inspire them and administrators appear insensitive to them. Many students are not certain why they came there in the first place, and they may never get a good answer.

2. <u>An attempt is made to reach out to someone who will listen and do something.</u> It is easy to suggest that students could go to the college president, a dean or the faculty to discuss grievances. But they claim that they too often get a run-around, being told only that the matter is very complex or that the person they got to, although sympathetic, isn't in a

position to do anything anyhow. When students are frustrated they want immediate action. Instead, they say, requests made through channels get lost in the administrative bureaucracy.

3. Normal channels are exhausted and communication breaks down. Emotions replace reason. Threats are perceived and fear is felt. In this atmosphere there develops a distrust of verbal reassurances, which are superseded by militant language and sloganeering.

4. Efforts are made by a few hard core individuals to broaden their base of support, mainly by finding issues with general appeal and giving them an aura of sanctity. Generally, only a small number of students and perhaps some faculty are involved in the early stages of a potential confrontation. They reach a point, however, at which they feel the need for broader backing. And so they resort to dramatic devices to shake uncommitted students and sometimes faculty out of apathy. This often is done by creating basic divisions over big issues stated in absolute terms so that there are easily identifiable "bad guys" whose immorality justifies any action against them.

5. Both sides take harder lines as they see their credibility threatened. The administration and sometimes faculty come under pressure from students who oppose the dissidents and persons outside the campus who believe that capitulation would result in anarchy spreading to other colleges and universities. The

protesters, meanwhile, extend their claims to include amnesty for all participants in a direct action.

6. There is recourse to a direct confrontation, such as a building takeover, to break the impasse. Such tactics get wide attention to a cause, demonstrate the protesters' contempt for "illegitimate" authority and give the activists a sense of power and exhilaration. The administration is forced to do something.

7. The clear-cut challenge results in a reaction, compromise if possible and repression if necessary. Sometimes an agreement can be worked out to end the confrontation. Failing this, police are called onto the campus or the courts are asked to issue restraining orders that may lead to injunctions. Thus, demonstrators risk being jailed or fined or both and may be suspended or expelled from school.

8. There is a catharsis followed by an attempt to put things back together. To some degree emotions are spent in confrontations. This helps to allow reason to surface again and efforts are made to identify underlying problems. Out of candid self-criticism come at least procedural reforms aimed at restructuring the university's decision-making process. Often, new disciplinary structures are created in which authority is shared among administrators, faculty and students. Curriculum revisions and changes in admissions policies also occur in some cases, with students getting a bigger voice. Ways are sought to improve communication among the components of the institution. Ombudsmen are designated

to try to head off grievances in their early stages. Broad power is given to new committees made up of administrators, faculty and students or to university senates that assume many functions previously reserved to administrators and trustees. In a few cases students are seated on boards of trustees with full voting power.

Illegal Acts

There is a widespread belief that university authorities have vacillated when faced with campus confrontations; and lacking backbone they have permitted the excesses of a lawless horde of dissenters to go unchecked.

The number of diehard militants actually is small--many administrators and students say less than one per cent of the students on their campus.

But colleges and universities were vulnerable to attack by even a tiny minority because they have not been law-enforcing or violence-suppressing institutions. To the contrary, they were communities of scholars operating largely on unwritten traditions. Committed to seeking the truth wherever it lies they were reluctant to take repressive actions.

In recent years, however, they have been forced to reassess their positions as a result of campus events that battered long-standing assumptions.

This part of the report deals with the university's anguish over and ultimate response to acts that violate:

(1) laws applying to society in general

(2) regulations particular to the university.

The Laws of Society. The disturbances that occurred at Colgate University and Columbia University help to appraise the dilemma shared by many school officials in the spring of 1968.

Vincent M. Barnett Jr., then president of Colgate, was challenged to decide whether the takeover of the Administration Building was clearly an illegal act and whether police action was warranted to end the demonstration. In that instance an agreement was reached with the protest leaders. But Barnett wrote later that if there were a "next time" he would favor obtaining a court order that "would make it clear that after a certain time those who remained in the building would be in contempt of court and would indeed be proceeding illegally."

At Columbia a few weeks later, according to the Cox Commission report, the most difficult problems facing the university "were unquestionably the decisions that had to be made concerning the use of police." President Grayson Kirk did summon New York City police who arrested approximately 700 persons on April 30 amid what the Cox Commission said was "great violence."

As campus confrontations in New York State became more frequent in the 1968-69 academic year beleagured college and university officials looked more and more to the courts for help.

As a result restraining orders and injunctions figured more prominently in incidents of unrest.

Examples included the State University center at Buffalo, Columbia, Queensborough Community College and City College of New York. They also were used in the fall of 1969 at Queens College and the State University College at Buffalo.

In the case of Queensborough three faculty members and a student were sentenced to jail terms of up to 15 days and fined $250 each for violating a temporary injunction.

In general, however, demonstrators have complied with court orders.

There also have been examples of administrators calling police onto campuses without recourse to restraining orders and injunctions. Those arrested have been charged by and large with criminal trespass, a misdemeanor.

Colleges and universities in this state at which arrests were made as a result of demonstrations, in addition to the 1968 uprising at Columbia, include Brooklyn College, Pratt Institute, the State University at Stony Brook, Queens College and Queensborough.

District attorneys have investigated campus disruptions. Among them were the Columbia building takeovers of 1968, the occupation of the student union and painting of an ROTC practice deck gun at Cornell in the spring of 1969, the vandalism of ROTC

offices at the University of Buffalo in the fall of 1969 and anti-ROTC protest at Fordham University in the fall of 1969.

Thus, precedents are being established for dealing in the courts with persons who disrupt college and university activities.

School Regulations. The trend toward court intervention has not, however, precluded internal discipline by colleges and universities. But a new look at school rules was needed since students were questioning the authority of administrators and faculty to act in loco parentis.

In recent years students developed two basic assumptions about the on-campus judicial process. The first was that students themselves should play a major role at the very least in determining rules governing their conduct. The second was that they are entitled to due process, specifically judgment by their peers and open hearings when cited under the rules. Since these premises were not built into the traditional college and university codes regulations were subject to serious challenges concerning their legitimacy.

Moreover, while institutions of higher learning were rigorously specific about the traditional parietals, there often was doubt about the applicability of school rules to demonstrations. Two striking examples of the problems that surfaced in regard to on-campus adjudication were Columbia and Cornell.

At Columbia student radicals were able to exploit President

Kirk's ban on all indoor demonstrations, which ran counter to the recommendation of a special committee he had named to review university policies on student rights and responsibilities. The ban was turned into a major issue by Columbia's Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), and the assault on the president's ruling hit a responsive chord throughout the campus.

At Cornell a group of blacks cited under the student code that took effect in 1968 challenged the judicial system because, among other reasons, no blacks were serving in it. When the student union was taken over in April 1969 the first demand presented was for nullification of the reprimands given three of the blacks by the Student-Faculty Board of Student Conduct. A key provision of the agreement that ended the takeover was that the full faculty would meet to review the board's action. In exchange the Afro-American Society said it would cooperate in devising a new judicial system.

Because of the challenges to school rules at these universities and elsewhere some administrators undertook on their own initiative sweeping reviews of their regulations. The purpose was to make it clear just what actions would be considered beyond the pale and what penalties demonstrators risked. In the spring of 1969 this was mandated under a state law specifying that all institutions of higher learning had to have regulations for maintaining order if they were to be eligible for state financial assistance. As a result all but seven religious-affiliated institutions filed with the Board of Regents or declared their

intent to file sets of rules including provisions for the suspension or expulsion of anyone on campus who violated regulations related to disorders. Moreover, the due process guarantee sought by students was included in most cases according to the State Education Department.

Outside Influences

Many students, faculty and administrators have expressed to the Commission a belief that fundamental ills they have perceived in society contribute enormously to unrest on college and university campuses. The two major targets of their criticism are the war in Vietnam and racism at home. But behind these issues and others raised by them is the feeling that hypocricy permeates modern-day America.

"We see hypocrisy all around us," one student told the commission in pinpointing what many others had argued in different ways. "In a nation whose rhetoric is one of compassion, freedom and justice, but whose actions are those of hate, repression and corruption."

With a selective eye young people are citing events of our recent history to demonstrate this contention. In particular, they see the U.S. interventions into the Dominican Republic and Vietnam as examples of support for fascist dictators abroad and the opposition by state and local officials to the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court order on school desegregation as a betrayal of basic rights at home. They are cynical about government leaders

who, in their judgment, squander on war the limited resources that should be utilized to eradicate poverty and urban decay.

They say the law is used rigorously to keep them in line, as when they use marijuana or demonstrate for causes, but that it is skirted easily by employers and unions who practice job discrimination and home-owners and landlords who discriminate in housing. The inequities they cite sour them on society. They expected the university to be different. But they have come to believe that there are many examples on the campus of the evils that exist outside it.

Concerned students look to the university to help them find ways of improving society. In some cases they call on the university officials to take a public position on the issues dividing society. Instead, they argue, they are getting an education intended to fit them into "slots" in society because administrators and faculty already have worked out their compromise with society. Specifically, such students cite the war-related research conducted on many campuses, the recruitment visits onto the campus by the military and representatives of companies making military hardware and the presence of another symbol of the military--ROTC units.

The nation's dilemma over its racial tensions also gets shifted to a large extent to the campus, since the argument given to minority groups seeking to move up the ladder is that they must have more education. This means that college and university administrators must figure out how to admit more dis-

advantaged youngsters to their schools even though many of them lack adequate preparation, and then to meet the demand that so often follows for a more "relevant" curriculum to reflect special needs and aspirations.

The misunderstandings rooted in social problems thus are transferred to the campus where they are likely to be magnified in times of stress.

At Colgate in 1968, for example, the buildup of emotions that led to the takeover of the Administration building was regarded as inseparable from the buildup of emotion nationally that followed the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr.

The special trustees committee that studied the Cornell building takeover by black students there conceded that the university "had addressed itself to bringing blacks to Cornell but failed to address itself to the special needs of the black students once on campus."

Columbia's relations with Harlem residents were strained by 1968 because of the university's expansion beyond Morningside Heights and its apparent disregard for persons displaced when housing units were acquired for institutional purposes.

Outside Agitators. While there has been no indication given to the Commission by members of the academic community that outside agitators have played a significant leadership role in campus confrontations in New York State, the Commission believes

that this subject should be explored further.

Its tentative conclusion is that confrontations result from a buildup of tensions and frustrations shared by students who react to them by seeking support from other students and sometimes faculty, rather than from outside militants. Professional agitators may seek to capitalize on the campus situation but this is not what most students want. The student leaders are jealous of their hegemony and want to be the ultimate arbiters about the tactics that should be used.

We may note in passing that one speaker at the first New York City public meeting asserted that campus unrest was part of an international communist conspiracy. One speaker at the Hauppaugue public meeting made a similar assertion. In contrast, however, a student at the Syracuse meeting boasted that the communists could learn techniques of organization from the students rather than the other way around.

Section VI

STUDENT CONCERNS FOR REFORMING INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The Students

The most striking single impression which members of the Commission received throughout this past year of listening to students was their sincerity and honesty. They spoke with urgency and with a depth of feeling for the essential brotherhood of man and they seemed to believe that the quest for world peace is still the noblest venture of mankind. In order to get our attention and to impress upon us the need for action they have used means which were both legal and illegal, peaceful and violent, constructive and destructive. Their language was at times shocking to our sensibilities, but they also spoke at times with the eloquence of silver tongued orators.

Our inquiry into the causes of campus unrest from the standpoint of student concerns has employed a variety of techniques. We have listened to students at public meetings, engaged them in seminar-like discussions, interviewed them, corresponded with them, observed them in student government meeting and convened them in a symposium which resulted

in several position papers prepared by the students themselves. The Commission met with at least two thousand students since its inception. We believe that they are fairly representative of the total student population because of the diverse viewpoints which they expressed, the varying perspectives which they held, and the heterogeneous social, cultural, political, economic, and geographic backgrounds from which they came.

Student activism has become as much a part of the 1960's as color television and the American Football League. It has created both bewilderment and dismay, engendered both plaudits and condemnations, and has made the approach to the next decade both optimistic and fearful.

The student activist of the sixties contrasts so very sharply with the student of the fifties. His clothing, hair style, modes of behavior, value system and very life style markedly differ from those of his recent predecessors. While students of all generations adopted a variety of fads the student activist of the sixties has gone beyond fads to question the validity of the traditional American values. He rejects the pursuit of economic self-aggrandizement for its own sake, the traditional occupations, the need for job security and the unquestioning blind acceptance of the status quo. Instead the student activist has not only become acutely aware of the problems facing society, but he is determined to do something about remedying them immediately.

Generalizations about the concerns of today's students are many and interrelated. Students will generally address themselves to a variety of issues such as war, racism, poverty, ecological imbalances, curriculum relevancy, dress codes, dormitory regulations, and academic freedom of faculty. Yet underlying all these concerns there is a discernable common denominator; the substantive issue is one of a positive and meaningful voice in the control of their own destiny. These young activists are asking for control and power over the rules which govern their personal conduct. They are actively seeking effective participation within the institutions which will influence their future involvement in the larger society as a whole. They are saying that they and not college administrators alone should decide when and with whom they may engage in sexual relations. They want to be consulted in determining the curriculum. They are asserting that they should play a part in the decisions concerning war and peace and the direction of our national priorities. They refuse to accept the status of marginal persons because physically, psycologically and intellectually they know that they are as mature as any adult. And if age 21 was a good measure of the voting age in another generation they feel that age 18 is equally good in this generation.

The best way to understand today's students is to listen to them. That is exactly what we have done.

The General Concerns

"We are students and patriotic Americans raised in a tradition of freedom and an atmosphere of affluence. Yet we are disturbed with our homeland."

This comment was made to the commission last fall by a junior at an upstate university and reflects what many other students are saying in different ways. In this case, the speaker continued:

"There is racism here. We see inequality based on color. There is militarism here. We see the Damocles sword of the draft hanging over our heads while billions of dollars that should go to our cities are wasted by a huge military-industrial complex. There is imperialism here. We see our armies defending fascist dictators in Southeast Asia and invading sovereign nations in Latin America. There is injustice here. We see eight men in Chicago denied due process while murderers in the South go free because the men they killed were black. There is poverty here. We see Senator (James) Eastland and many others paid not to grow food while 30,000,000 Americans starve. There is inequality in our freedoms. We see our parents destroy their lives on whiskey and their lungs on tobacco while we are arrested if we use the more harmless stimulant of marijuana. There is misunderstanding here. We see our parents yell 'outside agitator' when we protest, which is in effect telling us that we do not have the intelligence to see injustice for ourselves. The only outside agitation is

their own hypocrisy. We see hypocrisy all around us in a nation whose rhetoric is one of compassion, freedom and justice but whose actions are those of hate, repression and corruption."

The fundamental flaws in modern America seized on here reflect the deep student sensitivity to things that are happening outside the university, and they contribute inestimably to the tension on the campus. They sometimes may be pretexts and in themselves only peripheral to the real issues that ultimately cause student-administration confrontations. But events and attitudes in the national and international arena condition students to strike out at what is most handy, notably the university that they attend and which they expect to be better than the sick society they think they see all around them.

Said one student: "Society pressures students. This pressure is often concerned with national issues that are very important to us, and because of our apparent powerlessness to deal with such big problems we have turned to lesser ones, these being campus situations."

Student awareness of national and international events has grown significantly in recent years. Young people are better informed about such things as war, poverty and urban blight largely because of the wide attention given to these phenomena on television newscasts and on TV documentaries, in widely read books and newspaper and magazine articles, and sometimes in class discussions in their schools. Moreover, some young people from well-to-do families have spent time in urban ghettos or among the rural poor tutoring disadvantaged children or helping with pro-

jects aimed at improving the living conditions of poverty-striken adults. Teachers and clergymen sometimes have pointed the way. But such ventures often were initiated by the young who,not seriously strapped for time or money, felt a sense of purpose when they could be part of a cause.

An early example of this occurred in the first half of the 1960s when some students left northern campuses to help in the civil-rights movement in the South. The idealistic freedom riders and voter-registration workers were jolted by grim realities. Some were harassed, beaten, arrested and, in the case of three young men, killed by a mob of whites. They also learned harsh lessons about the fragility of justice. It was local police and local judges who were repressing the crusade to uphold the constitutional rights supposedly inalienably due to the blacks. And adding to this irony was what some young people regarded as a failure by Justice Department officials in a "liberal" national administration to deliver the unequivocal support the students had expected from Washington.

Mid-way through the decade, black militants began to assert forcefully their own leadership in the civil-rights struggle. This development, combined with the frustration and cynicism some whites felt over apparent betrayals and setbacks to their cause, set the stage for a shift of student concern. World events also had to be taken into account.

The comparatively ill-defined apprehensions over old Cold

War premises came to crystallize as the result of two unpopular commitments of U.S. troops in the middle of the decade. The first was the brief intercession by the United States in the tangled affairs of the Dominican Republic. The second was related to what would become this nation's long-term presence in South Vietnam. It was more possible to make a major cause out of the latter once the systematic bombing of North Vietnam--reduced to the simple symbol of a big guy bullying a little guy--became national policy in 1965. There was in many students' eyes a terrible hypocrisy about U.S. foreign policy, since the national administration gave at different times different explanations--some of them contradictory--for our being in Vietnam. Young people finally rejected all the official explanations and the intervention took on a new dimension in their minds.

Said a young faculty member whose views had been shaped by his student experiences in the 1960s "The upshot of asking us to fight in Vietnam against the overwhelming majority of the Vietnamese population has been to radicalize our movement. We have been forced, if you like, to read up on imperialism, on political economy, on capitalism, socialism and all the rest."

War and Racism

The two great public issues, then, on which young people have focused are the Vietnam War and racism. These have engaged the sympathies of large numbers of students, not just radicals.

And the impact on the university has been enormous because those who were most concerned about these issues could point a finger at administrators and trustees who, in their judgment, were paying only lip service to the ideals of peace and racial justice.

The students who first ventured from school to join the civil-rights movement left and generally planned to return to a university system they regarded as a potential base for effecting positive changes in society. The university then was to them, in terms of the present-day dichotomy, a legitimate institution even though basically neutral on social issues. But many students began to have different attitudes about the university in the second half of the 1960s as pressures related to war and racism worsened. They argued that their faculties and administrations had a responsibility to become more involved in these issues and to say publicly where they stood on them. The university, it was argued, could not equivocate on racism, whether or not it was in or near a ghetto, since racism was a national malady. And it should not remain silent about a war that threatened the educational future and lives of its students.

The question of student deferments, for example, thrust the university into direct dealings with the Selective Service. This was most evident in the class ranking it sent to draft boards to help determine whether a student would remain in school. Sensitive administrators and faculty were disturbed by this as were the students.

Moreover, the schools began to be regarded less as pawns and more as conspirators in unpopular war policies once some

startling disclosures were made about the military-related research going on on the campus. At Columbia, for example, student radicals crusaded against the university's affiliation with the Institute for Defense Analyses. And other students elsewhere went looking for comparable examples of "complicity" in the war effort at their institutions.

Meanwhile, the presence of ROTC units on campuses throughout the state provided a still more conspicuous symbol of the hated military establishment. Protests against the program continued into last fall, as at Cornell, where the faculty voted to continue ROTC despite opposition by some students; and at Fordham where, after a referendum showing widespread student approval of the program, an anti-ROTC demonstration by a minority ended with a score of arrests.

The university also was linked to the war because of the frequent presence of recruiters for the military and corporations like Dow Chemical who came to skim off bright young talent from the graduating classes.

In effect, there were many manifestations on the campus of what was seen as a militaristic national policy. And when students decided that the three "r"s at their school stood for ROTC, research and recruitment, the institution was tainted.

"If you ask why there is campus unrest," the commission was advised, "you must be told that it is part of a long and intensive struggle against what we now see as the forces opposing

the liberation of mankind. When Dow Chemical comes to the campus and invites our colleagues to join with them in the production of napalm, the effects of the use of which are all too apparent to almost every college student, they are inviting trouble. When the Marine recruiter brings his wares to the campus, he is similarly inviting trouble. When a university maintains a program to train college students in the art of war, especially when we know what those young men will be asked to do in Vietnam, it is inviting trouble. And it is not sufficient for it to excuse its activity under the banner that every professor is free to engage in whatever research activity he pleases, because we know who has the big money in this society, and who can afford to buy off that talent and brainpower."

Addressing the same theme, an administrator commented that war-related research on the campus, the presence of recruiters and ROTC programs, "symbolize the evils students see in society. They symbolize these evils by the functions they perform in that society. Those functions include the training of young people to fulfill roles--"slots" as the students would say--in the existing society rather than to change the nature of society. You and I may see the colleges as performing the latter function, but most students see it performing the former. This is the reason the placement bureaus and industrial and government recruiters on campus have become targets of protest."

Many young people also have focused on racism as an evil too long tolerated in America. They are impatient and won't accept discrepancies between rhetoric and reality. Too many years already have gone by, they argue, during which promises were made and broken.

The older generation points to gains that have been made in race relations, especially since World War II. The power of the Ku Klux Klan has been blunted. Lynchings no longer are a serious threat. Blacks are being elected to political office and appointed to serve as judges and named to high-level government jobs. There are new laws against discrimination in housing and employment. Millions of dollars are being poured into educational programs for the disadvantaged.

The net effect of these gains has been to accelerate the aspirations of minority groups. Blacks in particular have had held out to them the prospect of good education, good housing and good jobs and have been told that the way is open to them to move up in society if they will avail themselves of the opportunity. But they often find that there remain serious obstacles that frustrate them. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled against school desegregation in 1954, but many state and local officials have fought that decision ever since. Meanwhile, some top educators have maintained that segregated schools are inferior schools and that integration is long overdue. Yet

segregated schools still exist in large numbers.

Federal and state laws have been passed to assure open housing, but ways are found to skirt these statutes and keep ghetto-dwellers in deteriorating urban areas. Other laws guarantee job opportunities regardless of race or color. But blacks believe that they are the last to be hired and the first to be fired and that unions intend to keep them out of the better-paying jobs in such fields as the construction industry.

Thus, they maintain, racism still is rampant despite what government, business and union leaders say they are doing to change things. And the answer they often get is that real improvement will come if only they will be patient and get the job training or academic education that is available. The problem is shifted in part to the educators who must figure out how to speed the admission of more blacks and other young people to their institutions and then meet the demand that inevitable follows for a more "relevant" curriculum to meet special needs.

So far, many administrators believe they are showing good faith. But some minority-group members say there must be more significant commitments. The trouble, argued one black student, is that colleges and universities are taking only small steps and are likely to decide later on that they can't follow through

on new programs. What is happening, he said, is that "we've been told, okay, we'll try an experimental program. And then we'll see." Even when school administrators make a stab at disproving such judgments their good intentions may count for little in the face of a dramatic event they can't control.

This was, in effect, what happened in 1968 at Colgate where, according to then-President Barnett, the buildup of emotions on the campus that led to the takeover of the Administration Building was inseparable from the national outpouring of emotions over the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.. More recently, governmental decisions to hold the line on spending for education and social services were construed as a betrayal of promises that had been made. And not overlooked by many blacks was the killing of Black Panther leader Fred Hampton in Chicago in December 1969, raising more questions in their minds about what the white man is really up to.

Deep misunderstandings rooted in social problems and years of discrimination thus thrust themselves onto the campus, so that even minor hurts there are magnified in times of stress and school officials are subject to turmoil for almost any miscalculation. Cornell's Robertson Committee, for example, conceded that the university "had addressed itself to bringing blacks to Cornell but failed to address itself to the special needs of the black students once on campus. Much was made of

the question of adjustment to the university by the blacks but adjustment to the blacks by the university was sorely neglected." The result, in this case, was a buildup of aggravations that finally resulted in the takeover of the student union and the near collapse of normal college activity.

The fundamental assumptions about black-white relations again were on the line last fall as New York City's Board of Higher Education outlined just how it was going to implement its open admissions policy. The question in many minds--especially minority blacks and Puerto Ricans, since the number of students from their groups would double under the plan--was whether hopes again would be dashed when it had to be decided who would pay the extra $35 million requested to get the policy off the ground in September 1970. The state government and the city government were being watched closely, while CUNY officials held their breath.

Also last fall, pressures on academic institutions to do more for minorities resulted in protests at:

-- The University of Buffalo, where the focal point was admission of blacks into the medical school

-- Vassar College, where President Simpson and Trustee Orville H. Schell, Jr. noted in a letter to alumnae after a three day sit-in by black coeds that what the school "had thought to be orderly and due process in the consideration of their demands for black students had been interpreted by our black students as foot-dragging, evasion and even a breach of faith"

-- Manhattanville, another prominent women's school where a December sit-in over demands for more black students and teachers lasted for six days

-- Queens College, where furniture was carried out of the SEEK director's office by dissidents who wanted someone else to run the program there

The racial divisions in society also have led to a new dimension in the long-standing bane of administrators--town-gown tensions.

This has been evidenced in two very different ways. On the one hand, there is hostility on the part of the black community to university expansion that gobbles up inexpensive housing and replaces it with institutional buildings. The other side of the coin is the sudden appearance of significant numbers of black students at schools in white communities where, in the past, only a handful had ever been enrolled.

Although the degree of protest that resulted was not comparable, situations in New York City and upstate Potsdam indicate in their own ways how things can become aggravated. Strained relations had developed between Columbia and Harlem residents long before the student protesters seized on the gymnasium issue in April 1968. The irritant was the university's continuing expansion into the crowded urban area adjacent to it. But the insensitivity Columbia seemed to be showing toward the people who were displaced made the situation absolutely intolerable in some minds.

The proposed, multimillion dollar gymnasium to be built

on public land was viewed out of proportion as another example of land-grabbing at the expense of the Harlem community. Thus, between the time the rocky, two-acre park was chosed as a gym site in the 1950's and the unpublicized ground-breaking in February 1968, the attitudes of many Harlem leaders about the structure had changed radically. Once hailed as a symbol of cooperation and a "bridge" between the university and Harlem, since there would be athletic programs for community residents, the gymnasium ultimately became a symbol of injustice and racism.

At Potsdam, some residents of the rural community were disturbed over the unprecedented arrival in the fall of 1968 of 30 urban-reared black students who had entered the State University college there through the Educational Opportunities Program. The blacks, with their different styles, inevitably attracted attention and there were conflicts between the groups that were heightened by strained emotions. The blacks came to feel that their chance at an education was being threatened because of the grievances--some related to the school--that were building up. By mid-March, the blacks reached the point where they lumped together objections to the college program and social anxieties and staged a sit-in in a school vice president's office.

Concerns Expressed by Specific Students

The underlying similarities and differences in the concerns of students can best be illustrated by what specific students are saying. We therefore present a synopsis of eleven statements submitted to the Commission by a cross-section of upstate students.

Student #1. The university exists to provide not only the facilities but also a sense of community, of belonging.

What is taught in the classroom does not make an individual more aware of what is going on in the world but it does provide credits which lead to a degree and, perhaps, a job. The students at a state university view the school as "theirs" while the central administration and the public view it as a public institution to further the existing order in society.

Unrest is "rooted in the prolongation of adolescence in industrial countries." This is inevitable because society is not structured to accomodate the youth within the established status system. The students detect a general hypocrisy of the society and feel themselves alienated from it.

To eliminate the unrest on our campuses we must remodel our universities, institute admission policies to accommodate ethnic minorities and financially depressed but able students, change the curriculum to give credit to non-traditional but relevant courses, have an emphasis on truly responsive administration which reflects community.

A student deserves to be treated as a dignified human being.

Student #2. The causes of student unrest can be grouped into two main areas--dissatisfaction with overall societal issues and dissatisfaction with educational structures. They are not unrelated.

The university operating through principles of rank and privilege, of which the students have none, does not provide for student participation in the decision-making prowess. Students find themselves powerless in effecting changes in the educational system in much the same way that they are frustrated in their efforts to change the society. They feel the country is neglecting attention to problems of poverty, racism and injustice. Their frustration leads to alienation or radicalization. Some to choose to reform while others choose to destroy the system.

The educational system should provide self-motivation as a substitute for grades to stimulate learning. The solution is to make education so relevant to the student that he wants to learn. The present system stunts self-motivation.

The following reforms are suggested:

1. Elimination of required courses
2. Joint student and faculty participation in course selection as well as course direction and scope
3. Evaluation of teachers and courses by students
4. Establishment of a state-wide SUNY Student Senate which would advise the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees

Extend legislative internships to undergraduate students

6. Revise SUNY local college councils
   a. replace them with faculty-student governing and advisory councils
   b. change criteria for selection of college council members and add voting faculty and students
7. Increase autonomy of each unit of SUNY
8. Institute open admissions
9. Consider legislation to remove institutional racism, lower the voting age and mandate a majority primary system

He cautions the commission to act upon the causes of unrest to ignore the calls for repressive measures.

Student #3. Causes of unrest may be divided into two general areas--dissatisfaction with the educational structures dissatisfaction with over-all societal issues.

1. The educational system fails to provide the desire to search for knowledge.
2. Our present grading system is an external motivation, students are competing against each other.
3. Students are fed into college from the community and back out again into a slot for which he is ill prepared.
4. Classes are too big.

Students have no say in the decisions that rule their lives and hence become frustrated. This leads to alienation or radicalization. Most students, however, are not concerned about issues. Those who are become dissenters. One must distinguish between rebels, who seek change by working within the system, and radicals who seek change through destroying the system.

A reformed educational system would give the students a voice in campus governance and provide self-motivation rather than forced motivation for learning.

Student #4. Ideally, an education should provide an individual with the opportunity to think critically and to express his thought. Conformity of the masses is the desired norm. The right to dissent is not questioned but actual vocalization of dissent is objected to and negative sanctions are imposed.

Society views university education as desirable primarily as a means for future financial gain. People are trained to fit into slots in business and industry. Those who extend the educational process to moral-social questions feel frustration when they realize that there is almost no way to put the knowledge to use. A concerned person has almost no access to those who make the decisions about the present and future state of our society.

Students see the contradictions between the rhetoric and the reality in our society and have concluded that there must be a redefinition of national priorities. If changes are not made TODAY there will be no TOMORROW. They do not necessarily want to destroy the "American system". They would just like to see it function well. A communication gap exists and it is due to a moral, not generation, gap.

A radical is basically a politically aware, idealistic person who feels that change can only come about from forces outside the system. A radical is committed to goals that many non-radicals would agree upon. Disagreements arise over tactics. Not all radicals believe in violence as an acceptable tactic.

Student #5. University education has two functions. It is "career oriented", training people to manage society. It also provides critical thinkers, aware of societal ills who are able to suggest change. The problem arises when it fails to produce "thinkers".

Students who are not satisfied with career-oriented education have shown their dissatisfaction in one of two ways--the system cannot be changed from within and thus must be destroyed; through legitmate channels within the system its orientation can be changed. There is also a large majority of students who seem overwhelmed with the complex system

and are convinced that they would not be listened to if they expressed themselves. Still another group is not concerned with issues at all.

Young people believe that the society places too much emphasis on material goods as a sign of success.

She suggests that the voting age be lowered to eighteen and that students should have at least advisory positions on college councils, faculty senates, etc.

Student #6. The student wants a voice in governance of the university. He wants to participate in decisions concerning national questions now, not when he is 21. He sees these as important aspects of education and citizenship. If he is frustrated in these efforts he will be attracted to the use of radical methods.

In addition, he believes that better communication among the various segments of the community is a necessity.

Student #7. The causes of student unrest, as he views them, are as follows:

1. Lack of interest by many students in campus governance and in the college itself.
2. The inability of the college President to operate independently of the board of trustees.
3. The Draft.
4. Racism

5. Difficulty in getting ideas to the administration and having them adopted.
6. An outmoded grading system.
7. Courses are often irrelevant to life goals of students.
8. Restrictions on electives available to students.
9. Attendance requirements.
10. Communication failures.

He proposes that each of these areas need investigation and correction.

Student #8. Specific causes of unrest are loss of individuality, sense of powerlessness, the belief that the educational system is rrrelevant and detrimental to developing critical thought, the discrepency between the expressed values of society and the social reality, "the subjugation of humanistic ideals to the demands of a materialistic rat-race, etc."

He suggests as general solutions:

1. Immediate and unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam and amnesty for all in jail or in Canada because of opposition to the war.
2. Civil-rights legislation guaranteeing dignity to racial minorities, women, hippies, etc.
3. Automony for black and brown communities and the payment of reparation to them.

4. Closing of all foreign military bases, to be followed by unilateral disarament.
5. Legalization of marijuana.
6. Instituting a system of public ownership of the means of production and the distribution of wealth; democratic elections of all those in power, including bosses, managers, bureaucrats.

Solutions to problems of education are suggested to be:

1. Abolishing Boards of Trustees and instituting real local automony.
2. Abolishing basic studies programs and instituting Seminars and independent study at all levels.
3. A pass-fail grading system.
4. Abolish "in loco parentis"

Student #9. There are two distinct categories of alienated students. The first group is a by-product of large universities, which appear to be intent on satisfying the needs of the institution rather than the student. This group feels cheated by the extensive employment of graduate assistants as teachers. But it is this category of student that wishes to operate within the system and offers constructive criticism.

The second category of students feels alienated from all the things that are synonomous with authority, tradition,

respect, morals and principles. The alienation which characterized this group is essentially a modern one--intellectual arrogance. This group believes the world is ruled by ideas and when their ideas are rejected they become moral secessionists from established society and are impelled towards extremist revolutionary ideologies. For them dissent is not disagreement but rather a way of life, a radical opposition to everything the established order is or does. Don't give all your time to this group. Be concerned with the "in-system" dissent and those of the "silent majority".

He suggests that the university should keep in constant contact with the students, that counsellors should see students immediately upon request, that full professors should teach undergraduate courses, that an all-out effort should be made to have a student government in which individuals generally, minority students and faculty can express themselves and be a part of the decision-making process. The college president should make it clear that the college will not tolerate any infringement on the rights and safety of the community. Complicated questions of curriculum, admissions and degree requirements need to be dealt with thoughtfully.

He further suggests that legislation be adopted which

1. Makes it a criminal offense for persons ordered off campus to return without permission.

2. Revokes state financial aid for college students (not the college) taking part in campus disorders.
3. Lowers the voting age to 18 years.

Student #10. The trend in educational administration seems to be to put emphasis on buildings and structures rather than on the student for whom the institution exists. The student feels frustrated in his inability to make decisions in vital areas of his life. The methods of faculty and course selection and general university governance do not include him in a meaningful way. Attempts to introduce student ideas and ideals fail in an inadequate system of communication. There is no real opportunity for personal expression. He is frustrated by a grading system that does not recognize true individual merit.

The radicals who want immediate change do not always reflect the concensus of students generally.

Student #11. The greatest cause of disorder is the population explosion. It has caused a representative system which was adequate in the past, to be inadequate now. Politicians seem bogged down. There is a lot of discussion but little or no action on important issues. The system of representation for the people has greatly deteriorated.

There are many intellectuals who would be capable servants of the people but one can not run for office and win unless he is moderately wealthy. He suggests limiting the amount of individual wealth which may be used in political campaigns. Student unrest is not peculiar to the United States.

If the vocalized demands and apparent problems of our society were met tomorrow dissent would not end because the demands and problems are symptoms and not causes.

It is evident that conflict exists between the college and surrounding communities. It is suggested that well prepared regular programs discussing societal issues be broadcast by the local radio stations and published in newspaper articles. Once we acknowledge a problem then discourse may lead to solution.

Education should be a right of all individuals in the society.

Since its inception this Commission has spent a great deal of time and energy eliciting the views and concerns of the students of the state. As a result it has thus gained many insights and understandings of their views of the past, concerns about the present, and hopes for the future. While we do not unequivocally agree with everything the students

have said, we do agree with much of what they have said. Most important, we recognize that today's students are, in the main, better prepared academically and more perceptive socially than their predecessors. They also possess a genuine humanistic concern about mankind and an impulsive desire to improve society as a whole. And, finally, not only can we not afford to turn a deaf ear to them, but we must provide them with effective opportunities and means to participate in those institutions and social processes which affect their lives.

SECTION VII

PROPER ROLE OF CONSTITUENTS OF THE COLLEGE COMMUNITY

Introduction

The Commission was mandated to inquire into the proper roles of administrators, faculty, alumni, students and government in the university system. Because of the great variations in the types of institutions there is no one definitive conception of the proper roles. Hence, we present some specific examples reflecting the situation in (a) large state university unit (b) a large private university with some statutory colleges (c) a small private residential rurally situated university and (d) a small religiously affiliated suburban commuter-resident college.

There are both obvious and subtle differences. However, there is a discernable sameness evident in all--the concern with community--a search for roles in the community which will not only afford an opportunity to profitably contribute but also one which carries the status of legitimacy and consequent authority.

In 1962 in his "Eero Saarinen" Allan Temko writes of the architect that he "----wished to renew, maintain, and improve the organic expression of the 'civitas' (community) which he found weakened and virtually destroyed everywhere

in modern civilization, with one significant exception--the univeristy campus." Before the decade was over the pervasive dominence of technology had weakened but obviously not destroyed the 'civitas' on the campus.

There appears to be a desire for contemporary definition rather than a replacement of the authority figures.

These examples are based on a good cross-section of institutions surveyed by the Commission and are based on statements submitted by and interviews with Dean Welch of Buffalo, President Bartlett of Colgate, Vice President Brown of Cornell and President Duffy of Siena. These individuals have given us their permission to use these statements but we emphasize that the views expressed are their personal reactions and do not necessarily represent the official position of the respective college.

The SUNY Buffalo Example (Dean Welch)

The State University of New York at Buffalo provides approximately 70 different baccalaureate degree programs in liberal arts (B.A.), fine arts (B.F.A.) and in a variety of professions (B.S.).

Within this wide range of options, University College attempts to provide opportunities for intense examination of special fields for breadth of learning and reflection. It tries to aid undergraduates apply the accumulated disciplinary wisdom to contemporary professional interests, providing a link between academic and professional undertakings, equiping them for the intensive changes they can expect in their careers.

The major role of administrators is to provide an academic setting within which students and faculty may jointly pursue their learning experiences; administrators must insure an opportunity for free exchange of ideas for reflection and for the most appropriate development of programs.

It is the main task of faculty members to convey the understanding they have gained through advanced study. In addition, they must serve as models of responsible adult behavior.

Alumni have a particular role in symbolizing the continuity of the University, for the University is not a collection of buildings but of men and women who have jointly participated in a significant learning experience.

The main function of a university comes in the expansion of man's knowledge and conveying this to its students. Students must serve as a focus of a school's undertakings, which must be dedicated to their personal enhancement. The "proper role" of students is drawing upon the resources of the university for the maximum enhancement of their intellectual potential, creative abilities and personal proficiency. Students are <u>partners</u> with faculty members in the process of learning and development.

The Board of Trustees, not only deliberately selects, but also serves, the senior administrative officer by being

a reflective, deliberative group with which to weigh major campus decisions. While each Board of Trustees should delegate to the institution all appropriate aspects of internal governance, it should be willing to offer advice at times of change.

In a state supported institution, the role of government includes providing the necessary financial underpinning, maintaining an atmosphere of free inquiry and working with educational institutions to develop both broadly and specially trained men and women.

The Colgate University Example (President Bartlett)

Colgate's commitment is to the intellectual, moral, psychological and cognitive development of the individual and to the basic values of the liberal arts. These basic values provide the best educational foundation for a meaningful personal life, responsible and effective citizenship and leadership and excellence in chosen careers. Because the liberal arts concept places humanity at the center of its concern Colgate will continue to stress the beliefs of the liberal arts. These include a respect for reason; the central role of creative human intelligence; the interrelatedness of all fields of knowledge; the capacity and willingness to be receptive to the demands of the future; and the need for the capacity to order facts, perceive op-

tions, weigh consequences and make morally and nationally valid decisions.

It is much more difficult to provide a definition of the roles of the constituencies of the Colgate College community. Further these roles are not immutable but reflect the changing social patterns of the larger community. We can assume that all are genuinely devoted to the well-being and improvement of the individual institution.

The Trustees of Colgate serve in a role as guardians of the University. They have power to hire and fire as President. They must insure the financial stability of the college. And finally, they must approve basic university policies and modifications to those policies, and they must be willing and available in times of crisis to give direction, decision and guidance.

The faculty's primary role is in the teaching of the undergraduate body. Ideally they are teacher-scholars. Subject to the formal approval by the Board of Trustees, the faculty has the power to prescribe requirements for admission and of student's graduation, courses of study, the types of degrees conferred and rules and methods for conducting the educational work of the university.
The administrators are concerned primarily with execution and implementation of the stated policies of the university. Under the direction of the president, they are responsible

for the day to day operation of the university, the execution of its rules and regulations and the preparation of recommended future actions and policy.

The role of students must of necessity reflect the regulation and policies of the college. In general, the student body has little competence or interest in the technical aspects of running a college. Students have a deep concern and a somewhat greater competence in the areas of educational program, residential living, admissions, campus regulations and athletics. In all of these areas it is a necessity that the considered opinions of the student body be presented to all to insure that what is practical and beneficial to the college is recognized and acted upon.

The alumni body of Colgate is composed of both an active section and a larger group who support their alma mater but take a relatively limited interest in its operations. Traditionally universities have depended upon the alumni for financial support and contributions of time and talent. Much value can be gained from alumni providing intelligent criticism of the educational program, its value to the undergraduate as he prepares for a career, and the changing values of American Society.

For a private institution the role of government should

be sympathetic support coupled with an awareness of the neeessity of the continued independence of the institution. What this means for the private college is that although accounting requirements must be met and laws upheld, there should be no infringement on the intellectual and educational policies of the individual school. The value of private institutions is two fold: they provide great variety in the total educational resources available to our society and they share an important part of the total burden of higher education.

The Cornell Example (Vice President Brown)

Cornell has seven schools and colleges which offer graduate work and undergraduate programs leading to baccalaureate degrees. Three of the seven (Agriculture, Human Ecology, Labor and Industrial Relations) are statutory, receiving most of their budgetary support from the State and are part of the State University. The other four (Architecture, Arts and Sciences, Engineering and Hotel Administration) are primarily privately supported.

While all seven are in some measure professional and in some the professional element is strong, dominant, and sharply focused, in none is it the only element. The extremely rapid rate of technological change and the effect of almost everything we do upon the environment makes it increasingly necessary to provide all students with an education broadly based in science, social science and the humanities.

Arts and Sciences programs are strongly professional, in the sense that they are designed to train specialists in some particular discipline, who upon graduation will go on to graduate school or will enter professional schools. A large modern university with its massive investments in scientific instruments and libraries could not be used effectively and fully by undergraduates unless the programs were specialized and professional in this sense.

But the major aim of Cornell University as distinct

from those of the colleges is to develop fully each student's individual capacity to reason, to imagine, and feel perceptively. Not merely an appreciation and understanding of the natural world and the technology by which we change and control it, but of a world as composed of individual human beings, human culture and history. At Cornell the College of Arts and Sciences provides all undergraduates in the university with an opportunity to get some measure of a truly liberal education.

One cause of present student unrest is certainly the disenchantment of increasing numbers of students with the highly specialized character of our society, our technology, our education and therefore our lives. Liberal education and its importance is in the process of being rediscovered. This is happening at the end of a period of some two decades over which the responsibility of providing a liberal education has been shifted almost wholly to the humanities, and the humanists are in general quite unable to discharge it. Over this period some of the ideals of science and technology became accepted in the humanities. The ideal of specialization has produced a whole generation of humanists whose knowledge of the humanities is limited pretty much to each man's specialization and whose views of his own field, though very deep, is also very narrow. The humanist cannot provide the broad

understanding of the world which is the special province of the sciences, including the social sciences and engineering. The vision of both scientists and humanists alike has shrunk to a point where it cannot satisfactorily realize the liberal arts aim of higher education, and the young are increasingly disillusioned with the kind of human beings that this kind of specialized education has made of ourselves.

In addressing the question of the proper role of administrators, faculty, alumni, students, trustees and government in the system, it would appear that Cornell has three distinct major obligations. One obligation is to its students, to develop for them and to help teach them how to develop for themselves those capacities which once developed enable them to become happy and useful members of society, capable of participating intelligently and perceptively in those activities which shape the society itself.

The second obligation is to the society which supports the university's activities and entrusts it with the higher education of its young.

The third obligation is to the tradition and ideal of the university itself as a place where impartial learning may be pursued and transmitted.

Because these obligations may be assumed and discharged by different internal agencies of the university, conflicting

obligations may generate intense inner conflict. Such conflicts are now widespread in the universities of the United States and Western Europe and are closely associated with student unrest. In the paragraphs following the various roles are to be understood in terms of these three obligations.

Cornell University's obligation to the student is not merely to provide him with an education that is at once specialized and liberal; it is also to maintain the kind of environment that is conducive to such learning. Given the opportunity students will probably teach themselves informally as much or more than they learn formally in the classroom. But any university will in different ways at different times fail in some degree to meet this set of obligations. One reliable measure of this failure is the informal opinion of the students themselves. We must invite them, listen to them, and if they are unsound, assume the burden of proof by demonstrating that they are. This means that students have an important role to play, not merely in becoming educated but in helping the University to identify and correct defects. The University cannot adequately discharge its obligations to students without involving students in the decision making process.

The faculty, the central administration and the trustees

have the primary responsibility to the students. All three are responsible for the quality of instruction and for maintaining an environment conducive to learning. But the major responsibility for the quality of instruction and the atmosphere of the classroom is obviously the faculty's. The central administration or a senate (representing students, faculty and central administration) has primary responsibility for maintaining the proper environment outside the classroom.

These three cannot effectively discharge the University's obligations to students unless they are constantly informed about the quality of instruction and the environment. But the complexity of a modern university, its size, and the decentralized character combine together to make it exceedingly difficult for anyone to be informed as fully as he ought. Because only the central administration can make something like a full time job out of keeping itself informed, the general obligation to students is focused most sharply on it. It follows that members of the boards of trustees and presidents must be on campus much more than they commonly are, talking to students and faculty. It also follows that many faculty members should be talking to students, particularly their own, much more than they now do.

In time of campus crisis, it is the young faculty member who tends to come out in support of student causes; and this

is not merely because they are younger, but because they have talked more with students and know the character and justice of their grievances.

No one denies the university's obligation to society. At Cornell, one can state with some precision what some of these obligations are; for example, to acquaint its students with some of the massive problems of our society and to develop its energies in finding effective solutions to them. Cornell's College of Home Economics has recently become the College of Human Ecology. A few months ago the new position of Vice President for Urban and Environmental Affairs was created. Although these changes require approval by the Board of Trustees or the State Legislature, they are spontaneous internal responses of the institution itself to the problems of society and express directly the concerns of the faculties and central administration. This leads one to infer that the university's obligation to society is one to be assumed and discharged primarily by the faculty and central administration.

It is through the boards of trustees that universities are legally accountable to the public and to the state under which they hold their charters. Although universities have no legal obligation to their alumni, the alumni do form a special class of the public, a group of people with a valid special

interest in the university. For these reasons, the board of trustees and the alumni would seem to have a central role to play in helping the university define its obligations to society. They can ask about response or lack of it to society's needs. A central administration must try honestly to answer them, for itself and/or for the faculty.

But the boards of trustees and alumni can go no further than this. They cannot because the great problems of a society in respect to which universities have no obligations are precisely those problems which can in principle divide the society itself. Only on genuinely controversial matters is the university's response likely to be radically defective or lacking altogether, and in these cases the lack of response or what is taken to be an adequate response directly reflects the university's own way of protecting itself from polarization and division. The definition of the university's obligation in these circumstances by boards of trustees and alumni would be erosive and ultimately destructive.

The third obligation of the universities is to the tradition and ideal of the unconditional dedication to the pursuit and transmission of learning. Because the discovery and the teaching of the truth are inseparable and can occur systematically and effectively only in a special atmosphere of

disinterested learning, the universities are a major and indispensible resource of any advanced technological society. Indeed, they are so central that to destroy them would be to destroy the society of which they are a part. The role of government, therefore, as an agent of society is to support and preserve them while maintaining their integrity.

In the past the major threats to the integrity of the university have been external--from church and state--and the universities have developed strong and elaborate protections against these. More recently the threats have been internal and more ominous. Increasing numbers of students and young faculty members are bringing into the university society's own doubts about itself and its ability to solve its major problems. In part, this reflects the rejection by increasing numbers of students of the ideal of truth and a society based in part on that ideal. But it also reflects, inconsistently, the students own understanding of and dedication to that ideal; their wish to use the university as a political instrument to make their society honestly face up to the massive problems of race, poverty, war and the environment. The universities, they think, have served technology rather than the ideal of truth and have so narrowed their sphere of interest as to permit the major problems to be ignored or

formulated in a distorted way of denied altogether.

In some measure, the students are right about this. The universities have been too careless about how they conceived and pursued their mission. They have taken too much for granted the narrowly technological aims of society and have been too little concerned with the ends to which technology ought to be put. But to some extent they have failed their students and so also society in this way; the remedy is not to politicize the university and thus destroy it, but to restore its integrity as the seat of disinterested learning and teaching. This can be done only by the university itself, the faculty and the administration.

The Siena Example (Father Duffy)

Siena College, a relatively young institution founded some thirty years ago, serves commuting students of the Albany metropolitan area as well as resident students, on its suburban campus at Loudenville, New York.

Originally a college for commuting students it has since 1950 accommodated resident students. Today approximately half of those attending are residents on campus.

All degree candidates are required to master a college core curriculum in addition to the core curriculum in their chosen disciplines.

The major aims of the college is the development of individuals who are not only proficient in their chosen fields but who are also perceptive, constructively critical and adequately innovative; people who are expert in their chosen careers; who are aware of the world in which they live and of the impact of their functioning in that world. Through the "two core" requirement the college affords to the student a direct avenue to this goal.

The Board of Trustees, composed of five lay and twelve clergical members, meets the financial responsibility of maintaining the facilities for this educational experience and is vitally involved in matters of curriculum, student life and college governance.

An Associate Board of Trustees of eighteen laymen exists, not as a creature of state law but, as an affirmation of the Siena community. Its interests are common to those of the chartered board. It meets much as a board of trustees does and serves as an advisory agent to the official board.

The alumni, representing perhaps the best feed-back to the college of its performance vis-a-vis society, is involved both on its own initiative and that of the President. The attitudes of the alumni relative to Siena becomming coeducational were invited by circular letter. The alumni selected the basketball coach. They conduct regular "career days" on campus which provide an opportunity for dialogue with the students. They are active in placing recent graduates in proper positions.

Within its delegation from the Board of Trustees the administration sets the form and flavor of the college. With the approval of the Board it has the authority of inauguration and sanction in all matters affecting the college.

The employment of this authority is more advisory than directive. The student newspaper has not always agreed with the administration but continues uncensored. A faculty assisted student government evaluation of faculty and curriculum has been received by the administration.

The administrators are available at all times to faculty, students and staff. This preserves to the individual, whether motivated by anger, discontent or a spirit of helplessness, the option of airing the subject in a student forum, a faculty forum or to a member of the administration.

Frequent and easy contact with the students and faculty is a necessity in maintaining an uninterrupted program of instruction.

Faculty members are teachers of and advisors to the students. Answerable to the Board of Trustees and the President, the faculty sets requirements for graduation, specific degree attainment and curriculum.

A committee of four faculty elected members represents the interests of the faculty on the campus. This group acts in concert with the students as well as the administration. The sentiment of the faculty is to increase its voice in college governance. It is anticipated that the faculty will be represented on the Board of Trustees.

The student body has a voting minority on the Faculty Curriculum Committee. As in most colleges the curriculum is under constant review and most divisions have passed on suggested changes.

Today's students are no longer merely consumers of the end product of the labors of the Trustee, administration and faculty. They are participants in the development of the product.

A suburban college with about half its students commuting casts a different image than does the fully residential college. The commuting student may be married, is often earning the money to educate himself and most importantly he lives elsewhere. No doubt he has an interest in the policies and programs of the college but the great majority must devote much of their time and interest in other areas. The resident students articulate their interest in college affairs to a much greater degree than do the commuters.

The Student Government supplies the forum for the expressing of this interest. Additionally matters of discipline are handled by a student judiciary. Students sit on all college standing committees and in the foreseeable future will be sitting with the Board of Trustees as observers, as an aid to communication. Together with members of the Board of Trustees, Associate Board of Trustees, alumni and faculty, students acted on the Search Committee for a new president.

Governmentally assisted programs that do not intrude into internal college policies and preserve the college's integrity are welcome.

The Restructuring of Power

Many college and university officials responded to the tumultuous campus events of the 1960s by seeking to bring together the various components of the academic community--administrators, faculty, students and trustees. Curriculum revisions and changes in judicial procedures predominated. To some degree, power passed from the administration to groups comprising administrators, faculty and students.

Perhaps the past decade will be best remembered in higher education as the time when students raised such big questions about their schools that, as one graduate student observed to the commission, "faculties and administrators, to their amazement and dismay, found the critical gaze of academia that they had fostered so long turned on themselves."

It is too early to judge how effective will be the changes in university decision-making. But this section of the report will indicate what school officials say they are doing to reorder their campuses as a result of the challenge that was thrust upon them. Some representative schools are Columbia, Cornell, the University of Buffalo, Stony Brook, Vassar and the City University of New York system.

Columbia. "The principle direction, in our attempts to bring back an atmosphere of trust in the university, has been to

provide structures which will bring people into conversation with one another in more consistent ways than were available before," explained Carl F. Hovde, the new dean of Columbia College. "What we have really been 'restructuring'--that is the watchword--is trust among people who are engaged in a common enterprise, but to do this it is clearly necessary to build avenues of influence along which people can get from one place to another. Fresh organization is not a substitute for mutual faith, but it is necessary under our conditions to make certain that people are heard, and particularly that students are heard."

Hovde described to the commission, among other things, Columbia's recently created University Senate as a mechanism to that end.

The Senate is dominated by faculty members and has in it representatives of the undergraduate and graduate student bodies, administration, staff and university alumni. These groups, noted Hovde, are put in a position where "they must work out their differences in the creation of policy in almost all the areas of the university's life."

A graduate student involved in the creation of the Senate said he believed that it could "provide for the constant review of existing policies, programs and goals of Columbia, thereby avoiding the massive aggregation of problems that overpowered Columbia in 1968." Other Columbia students indicated to the

commission that they were cautiously optimistic about the Senate's chances of working effectively.

The faculty committee that drafted the plan specified that the Senate would have authority to deal with questions of academic policy, academic freedom, tenure and university discipline, with a voice in selecting Columbia's trustees.

In other areas, Hovde noted that several academic departments have established joint faculty-student committees to help conduct department affairs, that students and faculty have been involved in admissions decisions and that an appeal body comprising students, faculty and administrators was set up to cap the tribunal system for disciplinary problems.

Moreover, Columbia has hired a city planner and architect to plan the university's future growth on a long-range basis; set up a special committee to set policy on research contracts with outside institutions, including government agencies; and started new programs in urban and minority affairs.

Cornell. In its restructuring, Cornell University rejected the Columbia approach to a university senate in two key regards. Whereas Columbia provided for only 20 per cent representation by students, Cornell's plan was based on equal representation for students and faculty. Moreover, Cornell envisioned continuing its University Faculty body.

The Constituent Assembly at Cornell, made up mainly of faculty and students, and created to set up the senate, has

approved the proposal. The final decision by the Board of Trustees was pending in January 1970.

As outlined, the Cornell University Senate would deal with community-wide issues, while the faculty body would handle matters basically of concern to faculty members, such as salaries.

The powers and functions of the University Senate contained in a proposal made last fall included:

-- sole legislative powers over campus codes of conduct;

-- authority to make policies on non-academic matters of general concern;

-- the right to examine short and long-range university plans and make recommendations on them.

In other areas, the school President designated as Cornell's first ombudsman a professor of industrial relations and charged her with looking into grievances from faculty and students on innumerable matters of concern and appointed a Cornell law professor as the university's first judicial administrator.

The position of judicial administrator is described as seeing that "a swift and complete investigation is conducted" to determine whether there has been a violation of school rules in any campus incident. If warranted, charges would be presented to other judicial bodies. Otherwise, guidance and counselling are provided.

In the academic area, the Colleges of Arts and Sciences added three students to the Educational Policy Committee, for-

merely made up of six faculty members. The committee make recommendations to the college faculty concerning course offerings and academic requirements.

In addition, Cornell responded to black student demands by creating the Africana Studies and Research Center.

State University of New York at Buffalo. As a way of coping with the causes of campus unrest, Acting President Peter F. Regan announced in October 1969 the creation of two new positions at the State University of New York at Buffalo. These were the offices of university advocate and university ombudsman. They resulted from recommendations of an 11-member committee, most of those on it being students.

The advocate serves as internal counsel and is charged with initiating proceedings to enforce the university's rules of conduct. The office attracted quick attention when the first appointee, Robert B. Fleming, a law professor, became involved with the investigation of the vandalism at the ROTC offices in the Clark Gymnasium last October. He also handles complaints made by students, faculty and staff personnel on matters ranging from alleged discrimination in admissions policies to grievances over an employee's vacation pay.

The ombudsman is responsible for helping all members of the university community to deal with any grievances that arise. The office-holder also investigates complaints and seeks to mediate or conciliate the grievances.

State University of New York at Stony Brook. The emphasis at the State University of New York at Stony Brook has been on curriculum revision. The impetus came in the fall of 1968, when classes were suspended for three days so that students and faculty could debate possible changes aimed at answering the cry for more "relevance" in the various courses. Several steps were taken in this area as the result of a study in the 1968-69 school year by the University Curriculum Committee, which included undergraduate and graduate students. These were outlined to the commission by Bentley Glass, Stony Brook's academic vice president.

The university eliminated the courses previously required of all students in the university, and a more flexibl require-ment was established. As a result, freshmen with previous preparation in given fields could take advanced work at that time and be assured of more elective courses.

A three-channel system of selected majors was set up so that there could be interdisciplinary majors in such fields as black studies, linguistics and language study, social sciences and elementary education. Moreover, gifted students were permitted to create majors of their own choosing, such as in race relations, based on existing course offerings and extensive independent study.

New types of courses also were introduced combining weekly lectures with undergraduate and graduate seminars and a term paper. There has been an emphasis in the lecture series on contemporary social, economic and political problems.

Vassar College. Vassar College has combined curriculum revisions with such innovations as adding a recent graduate to the Board of Trustees with full membership. The first appointee was credited with playing a helpful role in the negotiations between the administration and the black coeds who took over Main Hall last October. A student also sits with the board's Budget Committee, and students have access to all board members through a conference procedure that previously had been restricted to faculty members.

The school has abandoned the old concept of in loco parentis and adopted a system under which students govern almost all aspects of their social lives.

Like Stony Brook, Vassar has created more interdisciplinary majors and permits students to design programs that appeal to them in consultation with an advisor. Moreover, according to M. Glen Johnson, assistant to the president, Vassar is "increasingly hospitable" to the notion that students should spend considerable time outside the regular class routine, working among the poor or in government, political party headquarters and model cities organizations.

City University of New York. New York City's fiscal woes last year had as a side effect a decision to get students represented on the Board of Higher Education, which oversees the vast City University system. Two were appointed by the mayor.

One is a graduate student and was a leader of the huge student demonstration at the State Capitol in 1969 to "Save CUNY" by getting more state financial aid. The other seat on the board went to a recent graduate of City College who is a community organizer in East Harlem.

The university also has appointed a Student Advisory Council representing the student bodies of all of the university branches CUNY's two major commissions, the Commission on Admissions and the Commission on Governance, also have student membership. In last fall's recommendations to the board on how it should implement its open admissions policy, students again were represented on the panel that dealt with the thorny issue of translating the principle into a workable reality.

Section VIII

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

To date eight public meetings were held in various regions of the State. All colleges in each region were invited to participate. An average of 25 speakers were heard at each meeting and approximately 10 written statements were submitted by those who could not appear. Each of these meetings was attended by at least one legislator who was not a member of the Commission. The summary of these meetings follows.

Buffalo

There was a minority polarization of opinions on such subjects as administrative indifference, student involvement in governance, the representativeness of student government and the proper extent of legislative concern with the problem of unrest. The majority, however, lies between.

There was consensus concerning the need for expanded avenues of communication among members of the college community and between the college and the public at large; that the college is a generator of new ideas makes it particularly vulnerable to unrest; and that outside police power should be used only in the face of major disaster.

There were some who saw the Commission as a needed agency to explain the situation on campus and thereby assisting in maintaining public support. Others called for greater disciplining of radical students. One witness characterized the radicals as the most mature on the campus and pleaded that they should not be impeded.

After citing many causes for unrest one witness noted the disposition of universities to react to instant stimuli rather than to take a position of thoughtful leadership.

Also given as causes were the crowded conditions as well as great numbers of students on one campus, the inability to give pat answers to great questions, the students desire to philosophize about such questions, and too much public concern with the campus.

In an examination of the mandated areas of study we note the following:

1. No witness volunteered any specific details of the manner in which incidents of riot or violence occur.

2. From all quarters came statements relating to the students desire to be active in the processes of institutional change.

3. There is general agreement that actions which are patently contrary to the laws of New York State should be handled by regular law enforcement agencies.

4. a) Faculty pursues and prefers a greater role in the governance of the institution. There is a recurring theme that their role is more that of researcher than teacher.

   b) There was no specific mention of alumni or trustee roles.

c) Students are coming to consider themselves not only as consumers of education but also as designers of the curriculum and of their own governance. However, one administrator felt they were now no better able to handle university government than before.

d) The feeling is that there is no place for a government representative as an overseer of college activities but some informal liaison is suggested.

5. There are many influences stemming from the general society which are mentioned as contributing to unrest. The war, national budget priorities and racism were among the most mentioned. Specific influence was ascribed to the withdrawal of support in the State Higher Education Assistance Program and reduced funding of the SUNY system. No "outside" individuals were considered to be contributors to disorders.

6. Seven of those testifying were opposed to any new legislation. Eleven made no specific comment either way. Suggestions for legislation can be grouped as follows:

a) General oversight of education budget.

b) Re-examination of priorities toward greater funding of special programs.

c) The possible mandating of an ombudsman on each campus.

d) Only if unrest grows to proportions where the educational process is greatly and generally disrupted.

e) Prep-schools for disadvantaged blacks prior to entry into college.

Statements by a faculty member and a student supported each other as to the situation at the State University College at Buffalo as it relates to the majority of black students. This

may or may not be illustrative of similar, but unreported, conditions elsewhere.

In essence the SEEK program which was created to bridge the gap between the underprivileged black and the middle class white institution does not succeed. Such blacks come to the campus as unmatriculated students. They often feel and are often considered by others to be second class. They mistrust the whites and the whites misunderstand them. Although sitting together in class the whites and blacks rarely are seen in mixed groups otherwise.

The blacks' effort to form an organization for their own activities is misunderstood as seperatist. It is suggested that they must find a group identity before each can do his "thing". It is only after they know where they are that the two groups can join together in equality for equal betterment.

The possibility of prep-schools, rather than non-matriculated admissions, is raised. Under such a program the black prep-school graduate would come to the university as a full student-citizen.

Syracuse

Students considered the faculty and administration as enemies, while the faculty and administration viewed the students with suspicion. There is a growing awareness of the

need for mutual understanding of each other's roles and problems. Caution is expressed that radical "destructivists" still exist.

One administrator suggested that the news media develop a voluntary code of ethics and rules for reporting campus unrest.

It was stated that admissions must become universal rather than the exclusive privilege of a few.

Recurrently, it is cited that more funds are needed to meet the present situation, not to mention those yet to come.

The sense of the hearing in relation to the six mandates is described as follows:

1. Nothing about the origin of riots and violence was revealed.

2. There was universal accord that the student sees a need for institutional change and desires to participate.

3. While outright lawlessness is the province of the civil authorities, there is near unanimity that recourse to the off-campus police aggravates the situation.

4. The proper functions of the various participants in campus activity are:

   a) Administrators are to be responsive, responsible governors. However, they are seen variously as misunderstood, faceless, arbitrary, uncommunicative and inexperienced.

   b) Faculty is the preserver of the climate of scholarly pursuit but most important he must be a teacher. Some perceive faculty as unwilling or lacking in experience to perform the administrative role they seek.

c) There was no specific treatment of the functions of alumni and trustees.

d) Students should play an integral part in determining policy and university governance. They wish to assume adult self-regulatory roles.

e) Most prefer an informal arrangements with governmental institutions in matters of governance. There was one suggestion that a body similar to the Commission act as a mediator or arbitrator when requested.

5. One testified that problems and possible solutions are sometimes directly affected by off-campus persons, but they are not identified. May have been a reference to suppliers of narcotics on campus.

6. Suggestions for legislation presented by a minority of those appearing are:

a) Suspension of support to suspended students.

b) Support of administration's right to govern students.

c) Establishment of a body similar to Commission to mediate or arbitrate when requested.

d) Open enrollment at SUNY.

e) Budget priority for special programs.

Potsdam

To the uninitiated all colleges of the same size look alike. It is pointed out that, on the contrary, each has its own unique character and problems. Thus, there are no such thing as one solution which can apply to all institutions. Some areas where collective concern would be of profit are suggested to be improved communications, broad-based representative student government,

relevant curricula, understanding of latent racism in admissions, and a realization of the negative aspects of the extension of adolescence in the student.

Testimony revealed the following when matched against the six Commission concerns:

1. The manner in which incidents of riot or violence originated were not explored in any statement.

2. As at previous hearings, the interest of students in the reform of the institutional structure is constantly noted.

3. There will continue to be acts of destruction by the confirmed radical minority. While there is agreement that these cannot be condoned, there is also agreement that repressive police action will radicalize more students.

4. The proper roles of the members of the college community are seen thusly:

   a) Administrators are seen at the top of the hierarchy, responsible and responsive to the wishes of the students, faculty and the surrounding community. They are seen as insecure. As a group they have not proven their moral worth in failing to have the university challenge the brutalism of the nation.

   b) The basic function of the faculty is to teach relevant courses. Secondly, their position in governance is held to be legitimate. Some view them as irrelevant and repressive.

   c) The alumni and trustees should encourage and foster responsible broad-based student government.

   d) Having properly been given a new role of decision-makers in all phases of college community, some feel that students are overindulged and lack time to handle the new tasks.

e) A consensus exists that colleges and universities need no on-site formal governmental involvement.

5. Other than the general social problems no outside sources of unrest or influences were revealed.

6. Legislation suggested was:

a) To insure protection of basic constitutional rights to members of college community.

b) Repeal of 1969 amendment to Education Law 129.

c) Amendment of Education Law 356, Sec. 1 to allow at least three students to sit on established councils with full voting rights.

It was additionally presented that the prevailing attitude is to place students on many committees, but that there is no guarantee that these committees can function effectively. It was said that students should be able to live with their decisions--good and bad--without veto by others, unless there is a danger to the general health or welfare of the community. In this way they live in "full time", not in selective, adulthood.

It is suggested that there is some connection between the phenomenon of the cities and campus unrest since most of the protestors have urban backgrounds.

A distinction between prejudice and racism was advanced. Prejudice is defined by this witness as the desire among one segment of the population that their degrading stereotypes about another segment be true. Racism refers to the political, social, economic status and psychological systems created to make the stereotypes come true. Thus, we can have racists institutions run by fair, just and non-prejudiced officials.

Hauppaugue

The student acts out his feeling of helplessness and frustration in one forum--the university--where he feels he has collective power. The traditional intellectual, non-violent probing posture of the colleges makes them vulnerable. The administrators believe that the recent experience of violence have given the institutions new dimensions in dealing with illegal acts. It has also emphasized the need for self-examination.

The student feels dehumanized by modern technology and is asking quite simple questions about the future. The answers to these questions are too often discouraging from his present view. It is suggested that human values, not technological ones, hold the key for a brighter future.

The fact that the more extreme radicals appeared in small numbers was attributed to their questioning of the legitimacy of the Commission.

Looking at out six areas of focus we see:

1. No one gave any examples of the actual evolution of an incident of riot or violence.

2. Long Island students were recognized to be concerned with bringing about change and with exhibiting dedication and ability.

3. The great majority of the community members are dedicated to the orderly approach. The campus cannot be a refuge for those who would break our laws. One speaker noted ". . .the more cooperation between campus and law enforcement agencies, the less violence and disruption will occur." However, there was the fear that the involvement of local police will aggravate the situation.

4. The proper role of the constituents of the college:

   a) Administrators. A role not unlike the elected official, responsive to his constituency but with the responsibility for the leadership of that constituency. Some feel administrators are distant and unresponsive. Some others felt that the traditional authoritarian role should be fortified.

   b) Faculty. They should prepare and teach relevent courses. There was much emphasis on their roles as social, political and academic advisors. One witness submitted that the faculty must be a modifying influence to guide students and that this is best accomplished through acting as advisors to student clubs. The faculty is also seen by some as distant and lacking in dedication to students.

   c) Alumni and Trustees. Neither of these roles were meaningfully touched upon.

   d) Student. The question is no longer "Should students be involved?" but "How far should they be involved?" Among administrators, faculty and students the "how far" varies. The consensus seems to be that he is an aware human and as such must have a voice in the decisions affecting his life.

   e) Government. There was no desire for an on-campus permanent agent but a commission-type body to act as mediator when requested.

5. No outside influences, other than larger social and political concerns, were put forward. Reference was made to the more radical student movement as being "communist liners" by one student speaker. One other speaker discounted any conspiracy.

6. The prevailing view is that there is no need for any new legislation since colleges have greatly overcome the deficiencies which contributed to the disorder of 1968 and 1969. Further it is submitted that:

   a) The voting age be made eighteen.

   b) That a commission-like body be created to act as a liaison between the colleges and the Legislature also to act as a mediator in the face of any further violence or disrupting disorders.

New Rochelle

The problems on the campus are the problems of the society and are the results of classic issues such as justice, peace, war, racism, etc. It appears that administrators and faculty as well as interested observers agree that the student generation is sensitive to and intolerant of moral dishonesty. The information from the students supports their view. The students see a vast gap between the announced aims of the society and the observed realities.

These students, having no status in the political process, act out their frustrations in the campus context.

The six areas of Commission concern are treated as follows:

1. There were rather general statements that incidents of riot originate with rumor or misunderstood action. From this comes an aggregation of students and an articulation of student needs, which when unanswered become demands. With the appearance of demands there usually takes place a polarization and mutual mistrust. When demands are not met the students seek other means of expression. This runs from the wearing of arm bands to the occupation of buildings.

2. The students are vitally concerned with creating and implementing changes in their institutions.

3. There was no support for the occasionally suggested conspiracy theory. The illegal acts which occur are thought to be the extension of legal activity by students. Then acts may get out of bounds without forthought that such acts would tend to destroy rather than reform. It is agreed that a very small minority is bent on distruction but that they are not part of an organized conspiracy and that they will be unable to enlist an appreciable segment of the other students in the future.

4. The proper roles are seen as:

   a) Administrators. Responsible to and aware of their students. Their position of last resort is understood if not always appreciated. They are charged with not maintaining adequate communications.

   b) Faculty. Greater contact with the students as advisors and teachers. Frequent reference was made to the lack of relevance in courses.

   c) Alumni and Trustees. Their roles were not exposed in any detail.

   d) Students. They now play an important part in the governance of the community. The extent of involvement and their ability to be so involved is a matter of disagreement. Some feel that credit should be given for socio-political work done off-campus.

   e) Government. There is no desire for or need seen for a residential government agent.

5. It was presented that outsiders do not create the situations of unrest. At Vassar males did appear to stand guard for female students but it was pointed out that they were cooperative and gentlemanly. It was felt that the press and outside police tend to aggravate the disorders.

6. Legislation.

   a) Lower voting age to 18.

   b) The addition of student menbers to Commissions of this kind.

The position of the Commission as an educator of the public was often stressed. Additionally, many speakers encouraged the Commission to examine the high school situation.

New York City

The crisis of youth is created not on the campus but in the society at large. Not the least of the reasons for student unrest is the artificial prolongation of adolescense from 13 to 26 years of age. It is felt that meaningful dialogue is the most important step in curbing campus disorders as well as the most important preventive measure. Students must have a chance to express themselves and must be heard. People, not processes nor objectives should be the paramount concern.

Examining the hearing in the context of the six Commission mandates we find:

1. When students cannot gain satisfactory explanations for rejection of their demands they take dramatic action to call attention to their plight. Occasionally their uneasiness is exploited by extreme radical groups (Columbia).

2. While most students are concerned with changes in the structure of the institutions, it is felt that too many of them are not sufficiently active in that regard.

3. One witness gave information that Mark Rudd's leadership at Columbia was inspired and supported by agents of the International Communist Party. He said that the national condition of campus unrest is a result of purposeful activity on the part of the International Communists. There was no other agreement on this matter as all others opposed the conspiracy thesis. Most cautioned that the outside authorities should be called only in the face of extreme, uncontrolable disorder.

4. The proper roles of the various actors are seen to be:

   a) Administrators. Need to create greater dialogue with students and faculty. It is argued this has been enthusiastically employed since the spring of 1969. One contributor saw the administrator as the business executive becoming ever more distant from others in the community and increasingly unaware of their needs.

b) Faculty. Viewed as now reviewing courses for relevency and becoming aware of the need to communicate with students as contributing members of the community of scholars. A minority felt that they should be more interested in the administrative processes.

c) Alumni. Rarely mentioned, but at Columbia they are being included as voting members in the University Senate.

d) Students. Now participating in the appraisal and development of the University purposes and commitments, of programs and courses, of community service, and of University governance.

e) Governments. Should be ready to support the colleges but should not intervene in community affairs.

5. Outside influence. See 3 above.

6. Legislation.

a) Mandating the Regents to set forth guidelines for the structuring of colleges, including representation by faculty, students and recent graduates.

b) Create an office to render conciliation service and give advice to institutions and their students. (These two above by Mr. Leichter, 69th Assembly District).

c) Lower voting age to 18. Although this would help it is submitted not to be the answer.

d) Examination of the budget priorities toward a greater funding of public and private institutions.

It is generally cautioned that current and proposed legislation is perilously close to forcing colleges into a vise between internal and external demands thus frustrating activity the proper concerns for educational progress.

New York City (Second Meeting)

Students consider themselves to be adults. Their demeanor and presentations to the Commission supported this view.

In comparison to the administrators and faculty these students spoke more about internal campus problems.

An examination of the statements in regard to the six mandated areas we find:

1. Violent disruption of the campus was rooted in the unresponsive attitude of administrators to the students needs. The consensus was that irrational acts were not the end desired but a means of getting attention, of getting a hearing.

2. Most students seem to feel that traditional activity--voting for student government members, etc.--is a sterile exercise. This does not mean they do not have an interest in college policy and programs but that experience has shown them that they have no meaningful voice in decisions. While the general attitude is positive they are guarded and suspect.

3. Violence, when defined as physical occupation without physical injury, is seen as an occasional necessity to promote a climate of dialogue. When physical harm is added, the opinion is that this is outside the law and should be so treated.

4. The proper roles of the members of the college community are viewed as follows:

   a) Administrators. Available to and responsive to students and faculty, serving and leading rather than dictating.

   b) Faculty. As teachers and counsellors more available to the individual student than at present.

   c) Alumni. This role was not developed.

d) Students. As not only consumers of the college end product but as contributors to the processes of developing the product.

e) Trustees. As having greater contact with the college community.

f) Government. As supplying an advisory commission to college presidents, not on campus but available to the campus.

5. No outside individual actors were identified although one student mentioned in passing that they were evident. The outside influence of social problems while a concern were not emphasized at this hearing.

6. Legislation was suggested:

a) To create an advisory commission to college and university presidents.

b) Lower the age of adult responsibility to eighteen.

c) Ensure due process procedures to students.

Alfred

The one recurrent theme was that unrest on the campus is a reaction to and symptomatic of the greater society problems.

On the part of the older generations the student perceives apathy, lip service obeisance or at best slow-paced action toward righting the wrongs.

In reference to the Commission's six concerns we find the following:

1. While one witness commented that violence and riot can be intentional none offered instances of the origins.

2. Students and others volunteered abundant testimony concerning the positive attitude of students toward initiating changes in the structure of the institutions. Formalized channels of up and down communication were noted to be in existence and about to be augmented. The emergence of the student as a member of operating and policy-making committees was cited as a reality and a necessity.

   While some students want a completely unfettered, social, non-academic life most seemed to agree to a middle ground between this "laisez-faire" and the traditional "in loco parentis" of past administrators.

3. The concensus is that any illegal acts should be dealt with by the civil authority under present law.

4. The proper roles of the various actors are seen thusly:

   a) Administrators maintaining the traditional authority figure but one open to dialogue and accountable to faculty and students.

   b) Faculty is seen as an agent of teaching and advising rather than as a researcher. It must develop relevant courses tuned to the present society.

c) Alumni should be informed about campus matters before becoming involved.

d) Students, as earlier stated (see 2 above), should be and are becoming a part of the governing machinery of the campus.

e) Trustees need to be in greater contact with the faculty and the students to gain an understanding of the day to day activities on campus.

f) Most seem not to want any formal controlling governmental representative on campus. However a repeated suggestion was that legislators be invited frequently to meet informally with community members.

5. One statement remarked that concern with "outsiders" avoids examination of the real problem which he saw as the outside influence exerted by the general society. One other offered that if such "outsiders" were involved they were not part of an organized conspiracy. Still another statement related an appearance of a single outside clergyman on campus during a disorder but did not suggest that he was a salient factor in unrest.

6. While some witnesses opposed any legislation, some such suggested were:

   a) Lower voting age to eighteen.

   b) No guns on campus.

   c) Reward grants to orderly colleges.

   d) "Last resort" laws dealing with administrations offering students no alternative to "expression by demonstration."

   e) "Last resort" laws treating individual destructive activists.

Legislation should be constructive and not repressive.

SECTION IX

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Campus unrest in New York State is a very complex problem. It affects in varying degrees each of the 212 institutions of higher learning. Each of these institutions is an unique case, differing in age, size, location, academic standards, stage of development, types of students, types of faculty, kinds of curriculum, administrative arrangements. There is no single piece of legislation, no one program prescription nor any simple appeal to the people which can provide an effective solution to the problems of all institutions.

Furthermore, the very nature of the subject matter involved--the values of the larger society, the specific goals of individuals and institutions within society, the instruments for effecting social change, the purposes of teaching and learning--is essentially human life itself. The Commission makes no claim to have mastered all this. It has only been able to touch the surface of these issues in the time available. The Commission needs to go deeper and to extend our studies into areas still untapped. But it now understands, at least, the vast dimensions of the problems which we were authorized to study.

Throughout this report run some major societal themes of student concern--Viet Nam, the draft, poverty, a national economy seemingly devoted to "militarism", the crises of our cities, environmental pollution, institutional racism and the eligibility to vote.

There is no question that youthful attacks on our society and campus unrest will diminish if the nation's priorities can be reordered; if essentially our economy can be regeared to that of a peacetime economy. This means that the war in Viet Nam be brought to an end as soon as possible. Furthermore, in addition a national commitment to eradicate the problems of poverty, urban disintegration, environmental pollution and institutional racism will more nearly satisfy many youthful ideologies.

In essence and to paraphrase a student ideal, the performance of America must be equated with the promise of America.

This report reflects our activities and knowledge gained to date. Our recommendations therefore are intended to be general in nature, broad in scope and flexible in application. They are designed as guidelines which can be individually tailored to meet particular needs and specific problems.

In any event this Commission fully endorses the dual concepts that every individual in all parts of the academic community must be insured the continuing right to realize in a responsible manner his or her objectives within that community without risk or fear of unwarranted interruption or

reprisal; and that each member of the academic community must be guaranteed full equality of access to due process. Both concepts are predicated upon clear lines of communication, effective channels for dialogue and a climate for responsible performance. Definitive procedures for uncovering and remedying conditions which violate these concepts must be clear and accessible.

Recommendations to the People of New York State

The Commission recognizes the interests and concerns which the people have expressed. The Commission has listened to the people and it is to you that we make our first recommendations.

-- Try to understand the problems of the college and university community. They are unique entities quite dissimilar from any other social institutions. Yet they exist to serve not merely themselves but all of the people. Avenues of communication must be opened between the institutions and the people.

-- Make use of colleges and universitites as a local resource. They provide innumerable facilities, services and frequently offer a wide variety of cultural events available to the public.

-- Obtain all the facts and evaluate them carefully before passing judgment on the academic community or even a segment within it. Information is available; use it to make intelligent and fair judgments and conclusions.

-- The Commission strongly urges the public and especially parents to sit down with students and have candid exchanges of views on the issues which give them cause for concern. Such discussions may clear the air of many misunderstandings.

-- The Commission recommends that the public should not form hasty opinions solely on the basis of the more dramatic media presentations of campus militancy but should weigh and assess all pertinent information in order to arrive at balanced judgments.

-- The Commission urges the public to join with the academic community to achieve a better world. The issues confronting our nation are many -- world peace, race relations, environmental preservation, among others. Resolution of these issues can only be achieved by mutual understanding and sincere cooperation.

Recommendations to College and University Trustees and Administrators

The Commission recognizes the similarities and more importantly the differences and unique qualities of your institutions. Because of this awareness the recommendations will be general. While many institutions have recognized the problems of campus unrest and are directing efforts to solutions it is strongly urged that others do likewise.

-- All post-secondary educational institutions should rid themselves of the image of a medieval sanctuary. Many institutions have proven the college and university can be a valuable local resource. The institution and its surrounding community can serve each other. More institutions must open their doors and resources not only to their own academicians but to the community in which they live.

-- The Commission suggests that the wide variety of cultural and educational programs as well as specialized services and facilities colleges and universities possess be made available to all the people in the surrounding community. If such endeavors already have been made, we urge their scope be broadened, their form be changed to meet current needs and information regarding them be more widely disseminated, especially to alumni, parents and the local citizenry.

-- College and university trustees and administrators wherever indicated, must make necessary reforms in terms of faculty and student freedoms. In some institutions this will simply become a matter of sharing governance; in others it will require a restructuring of the entire institutional organization.

-- The Commission recommends that college and university trustees and administrators take the leadership in seeing to it that the contributions of ethnic groups to the development of the State be integrated into the curriculum.

-- Administrators and trustees must open effective lines of communication between all constituents of the academic community. This should be interpreted to mean that viable channels will be developed and used which encourage dialogue and understanding between not only those who are members of the academic community but between the academic community and the public at large. In all cases special emphasis must be given to parents.

-- The Commission recommends that formal grievance machinery for all segments of the academic community be established and maintained, all procedures to be safeguarded with due process guarantees so that each segment of the community can make its views known without fear of retribution.

Recommendations to Faculty

The Commission is aware of the important role faculty has played in higher education. Faculty, like all components of the academic community, have both strengths and weaknesses. While positive contributions have been made by faculty toward resolving the educational problems confronting this state the Commission feels many more can be made. For example, it would seem desirable for faculty to devise new systems for evaluating and rewarding faculty effectiveness, using other measures in addition to quantity of publications, grants received, etc.. In addition, the Commission makes the following recommendations:

-- Include students in curriculum development committees.

-- Give consideration to the reorganization of courses in terms of new student needs and interests instead of existing specialties. A proliferation of courses is not necessarily the answer to improving curriculum. Less course offerings may be better than more course offerings, provided that the content is well thought out.

-- Faculty who are intent on revising curriculum should explain why they are doing so. The idea is to make certain that students and teachers understand why course sequences were established in the first place, why certain prerequisites exist for advanced courses and why specified courses are needed to complete a departmental major. The entire question of relevancy of curriculum can then be evaluated in this context.

-- Promptly make every effort to insure that the contributions of ethnic groups be integrated into the curriculum.

-- The Commission strongly urges the faculty to devote sufficient time and effort to the needs of the student. Make the academic community a truly collaborative one.

Recommendations to the Students

The Commission is impressed with the sincerity of the more than two thousand students with whom it had communication as they expressed their insight, concerns and deep understanding of the issues facing the nation. These students were generally cooperative, articulate and displayed an eagerness to improve the society. On the other hand, the Commission is aware of the fact that there is a category of students, small in number, who have become impatient and frustrated with the "establishment" and have resorted to disruptive tactics that are deemed undesirable. But it is to all the students that the Commission makes these recommendations at this time.

-- Accept the legitimacy of our institutions of higher learning. Reject violence as a means of problem solving. Work jointly with the public at large, legislators, government officials at all levels, Board of Regents, college administrators, trustees and faculty to achieve your goals. Use all existing channels to the fullest extent.

-- The Commission wholeheartedly supports the rights of all students to participate fully and responsibly in making decisions affecting them within the academic community. Furthermore, these rights should be exercised in an environment free from overt or subtle intimidation by other elements of the community.

Recommendations to the Board of Regents

The Board of Regents is the highest educational authority in the state. Their influence extends over all education--private and public, elementary and secondary, post-secondary and professional, historical societies, museums, libraries. They derive their powers from the constitution and from the legislature. These recommendations are addressed to them.

--The Commission calls upon the Regents to utilize with greater vigor those powers which now repose in the Board of Regents. More specifically, we call attention to those powers authorized by Sections 215, 226 (Subd 4), 237, 306 and 6450 of the education law.

--The Commission recommends that the Regents implement findings that there is real need for improving strengthening of the curriculum and teacher training in social studies and political science. This will afford students and teachers an opportunity for greater awareness and knowledge of the fundamental governmental structures and workings of the political forces that affect them at the local, state and national levels. This will provide for more effective student involvement in issues of the day and planning for their future lives.

--The Commission recommends that the Regents expand the process of involving students and teachers in a wide variety of educational policy-making activities at all appropriate levels.

--This Commission takes note of the Regents recent establishment, jointly with the Governor, of a blue ribbon Commission on Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education and urges that the Board of Regents extend this approach to the field of post-secondary education and conduct a complete in-depth study of the entire process--objectives, opportunities and instrumentalities for career development and fullest realization of individual potential.

Recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature

The Commission recommends no additional legislation at this time. We are confident that existing law provides adequate remedies under present circumstances. Furthermore, recent experience indicates that college and university authorities are becoming more alert and responsive in their handling of potential unrest and disruptions of academic routine. The colleges and universities should now be given reasonable time in which to deal further with their complex and unique problems without legislative intervention.

It is to the Governor and Legislature of the State of New York that the Temporary State Commission to Study the Causes of Campus Unrest makes these recommendations.

-- Lower the voting age and make corresponding changes in the laws affecting legal maturity.

-- The Commission strongly urges implementation of the Governor's recommendations on harmful drugs as stated in his message of January, 1970. The Commission further recommends that a crash research program be launched to definitively determine whether or not marijuana is harmful; in the meantime the Commission recommends that penalties for the possession and use of marijuana be changed in a manner similar to the new proposed federal punishment schedule.

-- The Commission strongly urges support of the recently established White House National Goals Research Staff; and recommends that by Joint Resolution the Legislature memorialize the President and the Congress that this effort should be augmented by the creation of a Presidential Commission to study the effects of the development of the techno-nuclear age upon our daily life, our values and standards.

-- Extend the Commission to continue the studies already begun. Additional important areas to the study would include, but not be limitated to:

(a) the impacts of emerging unrest at the secondary level

(b) the impact of special funds upon the quality of education.

(c) the dimensions and impacts of the "Open Admissions" policy as stated in the Regents Position Paper of December, 1969

(d) the area of student demands, particularly those of minority group students

(e) development of identification techniques for potential instances of campus unrest

(f) the feasibility and potential effectiveness of a permanent grievance machinery of an administrative nature for all members of the academic community

(g) the goals of the university and its role as an instrument of social change or as a neutral institution in society

(h) methods of collection, distribution, control and accountability of student funds.

APPENDIX

CHAPTER 1117 OF THE LAWS OF 1969

AN ACT

To create a temporary state commission to study and investigate the causes of unrest and violence on college campuses and making an appropriation for the expenses of such commission

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

Section 1. A temporary state commission to study and investigate the causes of unrest and violence on college campuses. Such study and investigation shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) the manner in which incidents of riot and violence originated;

(2) the concern of students for changes in the structure of our institutions of higher education;

(3) the illegal acts intended to destroy, rather than reform, our university system;

(4) the proper role of administrators, faculty, alumni, students and government in the university system;

(5) the extent to which individuals and influences outside the academic community contributed to such disorders; and

(6) the need for legislation to prevent the recurrence of student unrest and violence.

§ 2. Such commission shall consist of three members of the senate, to be appointed by the temporary president of the senate, three members of the assembly, to be appointed by the speaker of the assembly, and three persons to be appointed by the governor. Vacancies occurring from any cause in the appointive membership of the commission shall be filled by the officer authorized to make the original appointments. The commission shall organize by the selection from its members of a chairman and a vice-chairman.

§ 3. The commission may employ such personnel required and fix their compensation within the amount appropriated therefor.

§ 4. The members of the commission shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed for their expenses actually and necessarily incurred by them in the performance of their duties hereunder.

§ 5. The commission may request and shall receive from any department, division, board, bureau, commission or agency of the state or of any political subdivision thereof such assistance and data as will enable it properly to carry out its activities hereunder and effectuate the purposes herein set forth, and shall have the power to issue subpoenas and shall have all the powers of a legislative committee pursuant to the legislative law.

§ 6. The commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations covering needs, plans and programs to the gov-

ernor and the legislature on or before February first, nineteen hundred seventy.

§ 7. The sum of one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000), or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to the commission hereby created and made immediately available for its expenses, including personal service, in carrying out the provisions of this act. Such moneys shall be payable out of the state treasury after audit by and on the warrant of the comptroller upon vouchers certified or approved by the chairman or vice-chairman of the commission as prescribed by law.

§ 8. This act shall take effect immediately.

195